

ANGLO- SOVIET JOURNAL

CONTENTS

Thirty-five Years	D. N. Pritt, Q.C.
Babel on His Craft	K. Paustovsky
Soviet Writers' Third Congress	J. Lindsay
Moscow Art Theatre School	E. S. Saddlemyer
Soviet Criminal Legislation	B. S. Nikiforov
Conductors' Impressions	K. Kondrashin, N. Malko
New York Exhibition	M. Young

BOOK AND RECORD REVIEWS

VOLUME XX — NUMBER 3/4

AUTUMN
1959

THREE SHILLINGS & SIXPENCE

THE WORKS of MAXIM GORKY

Five Plays 7s. 6d.

Literary Portraits 4s. 0d.

Selected Short
Stories 6d.

Tales of Italy ... 3s. 6d.

The Artamanovs 5s. 6d.

Childhood 4s. 6d.

My Apprenticeship 6s. 0d.

My Universities... 3s. 6d.

Selected Works 12s. 6d.

The Three 6s. 0d.

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.

37 Grays Inn Road,
London, W.C.1

SOVIET WEEKLY

is a must

for the latest news and
articles on Soviet science,
education, medicine, tech-
nology, culture, etc. Sub-
scriptions 3/3 per quarter
and pro rata from Dept.
(AS), 3 Rosary Gardens,
London, S.W.7.

ESSENTIAL AIDS TO RUSSIAN STUDY

again available

N. F. Potapova. RUSSIAN ELE-
MENTARY COURSE. The most
widely used Russian textbook for
foreigners. Part I (352 pp.) 7s. 6d.
Part II (328 pp.) 9s. 6d.

Smirnitsky. RUSSIAN - ENGLISH
DICTIONARY. Fourth edition ;
50,000 entries ; 951 pp. 31s. 6d.

V. K. Muller. ENGLISH - RUSSIAN
DICTIONARY. 60,000 entries ; 699
pp. 20s.

from **COLLET'S RUSSIAN AND
MULTILINGUAL BOOKSHOP**

44, 45 Museum Street
London, W.C.1

The ANGLO - SOVIET JOURNAL

incorporating
The Arts in the USSR

Autumn 1959. Vol. XX, Number 3/4

Editor : H. C. Creighton, M.A.

Editorial Office : 14 Kensington Square, London, W.8. Tel. : WESTern 1571-4

CONTENTS

	Page
Third Congress of Soviet Writers	J. Lindsay 3
Babel on His Craft	K. Paustovsky 10
Record Reviews	M. Phillips 13
Thirty-five Years	D. N. Pritt, Q.C. 14
Soviet Exhibition in New York	M. Young 16
Conductors' Impressions	
London Tchaikovsky Festival	K. Kondrashin 19
Concert Tour in the USSR	N. Malko 20
Moscow Art Theatre School	E. S. Saddlemayer 22
Fundamentals of Soviet Criminal Legislation	B. S. Nikiforov 26
Surveys and Reviews	
History of the Russian Ballet	V.K. 31
Russian Classics and the Translator	Tatiana Shubunina 38
Book Reviews	41

Atoms — E. H. S. Burhop; *And Meteors* — Patrick Moore; *Chess in the USSR* — ASSIAC; *Hogarth's Analysis* — S. Osiakovski; *Film Maker's Self-portrait* — John Gillett; *Georgian Poetry* — J. Lindsay; *Burns in Russian* — Tom Campbell; *Without Focus* — A. Dressler; *A Neglected Subject* — E. J. Hobsbawn; *A Useful Translation* — E. Sawyer; *Aid and Trade* — Joan Robinson; *Mind and Speech* — Eve Dron; *Moscow Students* — Sally Belfrage; *Soviet Schools* — C. E. Simmonds; *Textbook for Foreigners* — I. Tidmarsh; *Russian Grammar* — Anna H. Semeonoff; *Russian Forms* — R. F. Christian; *Tolstoy for Students* — A. A. Pope; *Manual for Scientists* — I. B. Faden; *Shorter Notices*.

Reproduction of any article or review in the "Anglo-Soviet Journal," in whole or in part, is permitted provided that the ASJ reference is given and a copy of the reproduction sent to the Editor.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION 10/- post free; SCR members 8/6; joint SCR/ASJ subscription 19/- with reduction to 11/- for students. Single copies 2/6, post, etc., 3d.
Back numbers available.

Journal of the Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR

The Editor's Notebook



THE Society for Cultural Relations is celebrating the thirty-fifth anniversary of its foundation in 1924. Already, in its second year of existence, its late President, Professor Lascelles Abercrombie, was able to record in the *Manchester Guardian* that the Society had proved itself a valuable institution for transmitting the exchange of national vitality which the health of civilisation demands. Now, with thirty-five years of service to its credit, the Society can look proudly back over its experience (as the President, Mr. D. N. Pritt, Q.C., does on another page), and boast that it has contributed not a little to the health of civilisation.

With this volume the ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL completes twenty years of publication; it has been not the least of the Society's contributions to mutual understanding between our country and the USSR.

In recalling these two anniversaries, I am put in mind of an article by one of our past Vice-Presidents, Professor C. H. Holford, in the *Contemporary Review* of May 1927, entitled "The Culture of Bolshevik Russia". In speaking of the obstacles to a just understanding of Russia of that day, Professor Holford said that "in Bolshevik Russia we are confronted with a political organism so complex, so vast and so fundamentally new that no simple judgment on it can possibly be adequate", and pointed out that western Europe was as yet scarcely aware of the scale and scope of the contribution of Soviet Russia to the civilisation of the world. Thirty years on, it can be said that, though great progress has been made, western Europe is still far from full awareness. The great mass of ignorance, constantly replenished by media of mass information, is a humbling influence, reminding us of how much there still is to do. If readers would care to mark either of these anniversaries, they could do nothing better than to enrol a new member of the Society for Cultural Relations, or make a new reader for this journal.

Contributions to the work of both, in cash or individual effort, are always gratefully received.

* * *

Kornei Chukovsky

IN OUR next issue we will be presenting a profile of Kornei Chukovsky by our Moscow correspondent, and some reminiscences by Chukovsky himself of the visit by H. G. Wells to the USSR, written specially for us. Few men have done more for an understanding of Britain and America in the USSR than Kornei Chukovsky, through his translations. But he is even better known as a children's writer, and as a critic who has made an interesting contribution to philology, with his book *From Two to Five*. Readers may have noticed some remarks about this book not long ago in the *New Statesman*. Chukovsky was furious when he read them, and wrote, we are informed, to the editor of the *New Statesman* about them. His letter has not yet appeared in that journal's correspondence columns, however.

* * *

Georgian Dancers

ONE OF the treats in store for readers is the coming visit of the Georgian State Dance Ensemble in November. We have received two interesting books from Tbilisi about the company itself and the technique of Georgian folk dancing. The sources of Georgian dancing go far back into antiquity; I was intrigued, in particular, by a parallel between a Svanetian dance and inscriptions from Hittite monuments of 1400 B.C. In some ways Georgian dancing is almost the reverse of ballet — the women never dance on their points, but the men do — with ten different forms of movement on their clenched toes!

The Georgian State Dance Ensemble has toured extensively, and visited Finland, Denmark, Austria, France, Poland and Czechoslovakia. This will be its first visit to Britain.

THE THIRD CONGRESS OF SOVIET WRITERS

Jack Lindsay

The Third Congress of Soviet Writers, held in Moscow in May, was attended by Jack Lindsay and Ewan MacColl as invited guests from Great Britain. In this article Mr. Lindsay gives his frank impressions of the Congress as he presented them at a meeting at the SCR.

THE Third Congress of Soviet Writers differed in many ways from the second, of 1954, which I also attended. The second was explosive, criss-crossed with so many divergent trails that its total effect at the time was hard to define concisely. The third, held less than five years later, was much shorter, and, though not lacking in argument, gave an overall impression of eagerness to get down to the job of writing.

The occasions of the Congresses determined these differences. The second came twenty years after the first, which launched the Writers' Union and the idea of socialist realism; it had behind it the troubles of the later thirties, the war years, and the difficult last period of Stalin. It confronted a heavy problem of reassessment and revaluation, which it only partly tackled, and it thus was, in effect, the precursor of the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. The Third Congress came on the heels of the Twenty-first Congress of the Party with its inauguration of the seven-year plan and the goal of reaching the "foothills of communism". The writers had to get on with thinking things out in a scene where the tempo was set and the perspective determined by a sharp forward movement with widened plans and the ever-present concept of transforming socialism into communism. Their Congress was inevitably one of consolidation: a review of resources and an attempt to brace the thews for hard work. The stress was put on raising the quality of writing, deepening the psychological grasp and keeping in pace with the profound changes going on in people, and clarifying the problem of "innovation" in this situation.

Two matters dominated the Congress: on the one hand the implications of the seven-year plan, and on the other the growth of the various national literatures in the Soviet Union since 1954. The multi-national nature of Soviet culture is at last becoming an effective feature. That is, the exchanges and influences are beginning to flow in all directions, even if Russian culture still remains dominant; a new stage has been reached in the autonomy and confidence of the national cultures, which is going to have accumulative effects in the future.

The opening report by the General Secretary, Surkov, failed to set the right keynote; and for this the whole leadership of the Union was to blame. The report was one of those omnibus efforts to combine the detailed findings of a horde of committees. Nobody liked it. Tvardovsky, editor of *Novy Mir*, summed up its indigestibility: "A whole village can't write one letter." And Smirnov, the new editor of *Literaturnaya Gazeta*,* deplored the lack of individuality produced by "a maze of formulas" and "the fallacy that a report must be all-embracing: put in everything and you bring nothing out".

* Smirnov detailed his excellent efforts to reorganise the *Gazette* after the mess it had been left in by Kochetov. All remarks to the discredit of Kochetov evoked applause, e.g. when Kirsanov declared that in *The Brothers Yershov* he deliberately painted a false picture of the 1956 conflicts as between solid proletarians and demoralised, long-haired intellectuals.

He wanted an imaginative probing of the literary process as a whole for the essential trends and problems.

The result was what Tvardovsky called a "fragmentation". (There were only five days for the delegates of forty-nine nationalities, not to mention the many guest speakers, to put their points; and things were not made easier by the indiscipline of the delegates, not one of whom kept to his allotted time.) Yet, despite the lack of a comprehensive analysis or of give-and-take in the speeches, at the end something like a coherent picture of the present phase of Soviet literature did emerge.

* * *

THE main questions were: the creation of a literature that had close links with the people; the development of what was called the "topical theme" (though "contemporary" gives a better idea of what was meant); the rival claims of realism and romanticism, the nature of innovation, of the new forms needed for expressing the new content of life; and (to a lesser degree) the nature of language in literary process.

All these questions were interdependent. A literature with relevance to the thoughts and feelings of the men and women of the seven-year plan would necessarily be both "close to the people" and concerned with the "contemporary theme". Without both realism and romanticism (that is, without truth and a many-sided penetration into reality, and all the elements of lyricism, fantasy and aspiration that stir in such a scene) it would fail to define the fullness of the developments going on. And it would also fail without a deepened power of expression and a vital use of language, a readiness to find and explore new forms or methods of writing. No speaker, however, tried to synthesise the issues or relate them in specific ways to the society of the seven-year plan — to the situation which seems to me summed up in the resolution of the Twenty-first Congress:

... the main emphasis in the development of the socialist state is to be laid on the all-round development of democracy, on drawing all citizens into taking part in the management of economic and cultural affairs and conducting public affairs. It is necessary to enhance the role of the Soviets as mass organisations of the working people. Many of the functions now performed by state agencies should gradually pass to public organisations. Questions related to cultural services, public health, physical culture and sport should be handled with the active and broad participation of public organisations. . . .

If the speakers had concretely related their comments to the problems of this emerging phase in Soviet society they would have brought their generalisations down to earth.

It may seem odd that after more than forty years of socialism the writers feel it necessary to exhort themselves to get close to the people. Our middle-class writers in Britain, for instance, are anything but aloof from their own class and its day-to-day concerns; and I have been inclined to blame the continuance of the problem of isolation in the Soviet Union on a sort of conservatoire tradition of an intellectual caste built up in czarist days. Remember that the very term *intelligentsia* is Russian and reveals the intellectuals in a professional grouping that stood apart from the ramshackle feudalism and the imperfectly developed bourgeoisie. One has also to keep in mind the vastness of Russia and the ease with which intellectuals can slide into clusters located in the big cities, especially Moscow and Leningrad. And the problem of keeping pace with the changes of society under socialism has certainly contributed towards making many writers play for safety and retreat into the segregation of the many easy jobs going. But when all is said, the phenomenon is baffling and must be related to the political situation in the post-war years when the "no conflict" theory dominated, and too close a knowledge of what was going on among the people was liable to be uncomfortable, since it made

the writer less capable of turning out works with the accepted pattern. However that may be, Sholokhov, who has always resolutely stuck to his home village, felt it necessary in 1954 to pour scorn on the mass of writers as living in one village outside Moscow and one street inside Moscow, without even knowing anything about the people in even those restricted areas.

The conventional solution has been for the writer to go on a holiday to a construction site or collective farm after "material" — the so-called "creative trip" or "journey". This procedure, I am pleased to say, aroused no enthusiasm at the Third Congress; in fact it was treated with sarcastic scorn. The decentralising trends in all spheres of Soviet life, which have already much increased the powers and initiatives in the hands of the provincial and republican groups of writers, are clearly going to continue with yet more momentum. Khrushchev and others spoke with encouragement for writers who preferred to stay on at their place of original work rather than slide into cushy metropolitan jobs. Khrushchev (as also Tvardovsky) contrasted the hard self-dedicated lives of the great writers under czarism with the easier ways of many Soviet writers. He remarked that difficult conditions could not be artificially created — that would be a backward step — but writers must create their own "difficulties": the way of life which embodied for them the most effective creative discipline and fulfilment.

Though the question of the "contemporary theme" was much invoked in speeches, no one specified what was meant by it or analysed any types of significant conflict. Yet here was the essence of the problem of being close to the people, a part of the people. (Paustovsky pointed out strongly that the "contemporary theme" must not be understood journalistically, as a superficial topicality, and that a profound historical novel could be "contemporary" whereas an up-to-the-minute triviality had no claim to the term.) Again, though there was much said about "innovation" — generally with agreement on the need for new forms expressive of new content — the comments were almost all of a general kind.

The question of language, though only raised definitely by Paustovsky, seems to me extremely relevant to the questions of contemporaneity and innovation. For long the efforts to use literature in a narrow and mechanical way as an educative agent has meant that "correct writing" has too often been interpreted as "writing that helps not-very-literate peasants or workers to talk and write in academically correct Russian". As a result, not only solecisms or ungrammatical forms (used to define character) have been condemned, but also dialect variations, folk forms, popular diction, speech with a vivid immediacy, a lyrical sparkle, an original turn of phrase, have been frowned on or ironed out as "incorrect", a deviation from the Tolstoyan norm set up for all eternity. As a very talented writer said to me: "Some remarks of Gorky were seized on and applied in a rigid and comprehensive way that Gorky never intended. In the argument between Gorky and Panferov on language, Panferov was in the right — though I don't generally support his views." The problem of renewing language is in fact identical with that of being close to the people. A conservative tradition favours the preaching of academic correctness, whereas a writer in real contact with the people at their places of work and play could not help being strongly moved by the need to implement "correct diction" with the lively imagery, the word play of all sorts, the humorous and satirical phrase-invention and the moments of poetic concision which are characteristic of the common folk everywhere. Paustovsky declared that the salvation of the Russian language was an urgent and immediate task; language was being bureaucratised from top to bottom, from radio, speeches, newspapers, to every moment of daily life. And the same destruction was going on in all the various republican languages. Nearly all

were being "groomed down to the level of mutilated Russian". The rich singing speech of the Ukraine was being murdered by the universal tendency to flatten, level and deaden by bureaucratism and jargon. He then cited several young writers whom he stated to be anti-jargonists, working in a style that came truly from the life and poetry of the people, the colours of Russian earth.

* * *

I SHOULD now like to give some summaries of speeches, to bring out more clearly the sorts of things that were said. The Georgian poet Abaschidze attacked the idea that simplicity in art meant poverty of content; it meant a work from which nothing could be taken, and to which nothing could be added, without injury. He traced the many weaknesses of Soviet writing to the extreme novelty of the themes and problems confronting the writers. Theoretically, they did not lower their standards; but in practice? If, however, the writers treated their works on the level of consumer goods, they were the ones to blame for the cheapening of their wares. He suggested a society of the friends of the poetry, Union-wide, on the lines of the new people's universities.

Kirsanov recalled the 1925 meeting of proletarian writers. Looking back, could we say that those men had met the demands of their epoch? Yes. In the same distance of time from now, when people looked back to 1959 and asked the same question of the writers of today, what would be the answer? Yes — but also a very loud no! Readers were too often ahead of writers. To a man of advanced technical level in work the writers offered mediocre confections of outworn techniques. The two main obstacles to progress were the systematic log-rolling and clique-advertisement of tame mediocre works, which thus became elevated into models, and the backwardness of the critics, who never lost a chance to attack any non-naturalistic writer. "Do we need this intolerance for new and intelligent work?" The pioneering spirit was a complex matter, not just a matter of devising new forms, but also of sharing the experience of the people who were breaking into new dimensions of life.

Okhlopov, the actor-manager, attacked "shallow realism", wanted deep passions, called for tragedies and "truth and nothing but truth". Novichenko, like several speakers, dealt with romanticism, praised it as necessary, but stressed the weakness of too many books which lacked a realistic grasp of psychological analysis and sought to compensate with hyperbolic romanticism; a fullness of approach was needed.*

Tvardovsky stressed the need for quality and made fun of the equation of books and consumer goods. More writers were ready to be responsible for managing, directing and running letters in general than for doing their own writing; a writer's responsibility must be centred at home. To answer for oneself was a whole-time job. "I want to serve my country with my pen" sounds a noble sentiment, but it is just conceit. We need the self-dedication of the great writers of the past. No theoretical formulations can justify bad or drab work. "Even if you put sugar on a frog I won't eat it." Write as your conscience and knowledge tell you; do not fear critics and publishers beforehand; a big book can always beat any ban. At the same time be self-critical. Granin of Leningrad raised the question of happiness. In the past a happy hero was liable to look merely insensitive; but now the problem of happiness was becoming a crucial one for the author's powers of presentation. Sobolev, secretary of the Russian Union of Soviet Writers, defined the "contemporary theme" as awareness of the scale of struggle on our planet.

Paustovsky, too ill to attend, had his speech printed in *Literaturnaya*

* Much emphasis was laid by speakers, especially Gonchar, on the highly lyrical and romantic work of Dovzhenko in film-scripts. One gathered that they were replying to earlier denigrations.

Gazeta. He began by saying that surrealism and the rest of such movements represented the natural and right revolt of youth against staid and set positions of their elders. "Don't get into a panic about them." Perhaps we shout so much about truth in literature because we lack it. The moment a writer put his pen to paper he gave himself away. Pitiful indeed was the writer who surrendered the truth for non-literary reasons. The people see all, understand all, and will never forgive a writer his falsity and deceit. Nothing offends more than an author's hypocrisy. Authorship is a life vocation and the writer must fight for reason, truth, justice, in entire readiness to sacrifice everything for his ideas. There was no need for writers to "pay their compliments to the public" like a clown running out of the circus ring — following up any admission of shortcomings or distortions with a reassuring catalogue of all the Soviet Union's achievements, and falsifying their works with a sweetly happy ending, a false balance of light and shadow in a rosy-blue diffusion. It was fortunate that Tolstoy wrote *Anna Karenina* before this tradition appeared. "He could allow Anna to break up her family and depart from life for purely personal, and consequently impermissible, considerations." Further, it was necessary to put a stop to calling friends foes because they told unpleasant truths and showed a lack of hypocrisy — men selflessly devoted to their people and land, and making no claim to a monopoly of devotion and rewards. It was necessary to fear not being misunderstood, but being incorrectly interpreted.*

There were a few blanket references to western culture as decadent; but much more typical of the Congress were the speeches making a serious and sympathetic effort to enter into the problems of writers in a non-socialist culture. Chakovsky, editor of *Foreign Literature*, declaring there was no "third way", spoke with respect of writers like Greene and Sartre. Zelinsky insisted on the need to examine works on their merits, to avoid all abuse, and to give precise definitions of terms like Modernism, Decadence, Abstraction; if one looked without preconceptions inside the work of writers who had been carelessly labelled with those terms, one would find many who were close to the new ideals.

Khrushchev's long impromptu speech in many ways made the Congress, gave it its distinctive note. In a homely, easy style, quietly familiar, humble and humorous, without a gesture or the least raising of the voice, he made a call for the ending of animosities and for a confident trust in people. He used his famous Stalin-speech as an example of the non-prettifying approach to reality. "To stop any repetition of the grave errors of the past, it is necessary to lay wholly bare the shortcomings that have come about, so that the bad smell will stir up disgust for what has outlived itself." And while deprecating what he called the privy-focus as the means of showing the life of a man, a society, he spoke amiably of Dudintsev as no foe of the Soviet system. "Mikoyan told me: 'Read it [*Not By Bread Alone*] — he has some points

* Many writers, probably the majority at the Congress, would take the line that Paustovsky the "liberal" and Kochetov the "sectarian" were both demagogues trying to win over the youth. This would be the centrist position. I feel, however, that such a view reflects the overwhelming weight of old and exhausted writers, who do not want to be disturbed and who have resented Khrushchev's "revelations". Many changes will be needed before the "dead weight" goes and the young writers play the correct part in the Union, which will then become an effective discussion ground and seeding plot for new ideas, new forms.

The isolation of the older writers who form the majority of the Union appears in the almost total neglect of mass-media, the absence of adventurous documentary forms, etc., also in the lack of serious consideration of the relation of science and literature in such a society as the USSR — the fundamental relation, not minor offshoots like science-fiction.

that sound as though he has been overhearing you'." He made it clear, against the wishes of some diehards, that the government had no intention of interfering with publications and imposing bans; it was up to the writers to sort out their own problems. His speech was strongly aimed against the undercover intrigues, backbiting and careerism which have too often distinguished the inner life of the Union and which have been made possible by the segregated mode of working. It would be too much to hope that some of the astute cliques of mediocre and heavily conservative writers will now collapse; but it is clear they are fighting a losing battle. They have been responsible in the past for the worst features of Soviet intellectual life and constitute the main obstacles to the new forces and ideas; I have a good idea that it was they who stampeded the Union into the actions against Pasternak which have done such incalculable harm to the prestige of Soviet culture abroad — in this they got ahead of the leadership, which, however, did its best to stop things going any farther. (Khrushchev's speech may be taken to represent both a personal victory and a defeat for the cliques. Many of the older writers have opposed him for his revelations; and one of these at least was moved to tears by his speech and went afterwards to him, saying: "I make my peace with you.")

The Congress, then, I felt to mark a very considerable advance in the Soviet cultural situation. It showed a serious and solid desire to get down to creative work in the area cleared by the controversies and discussions of the last five years; and the election of Fedin, a non-party man of deep culture and wide sympathies, as General Secretary, was certainly the direct expression of this desire.* (The organisational changes in the Union, though not completed when I left, have as clearly been along the lines of breaking down the top-heavy organisation and of no longer involving numbers of writers in heavy administrative work. They will therefore help to break down the cliquism with all its bad effects.)

The main weakness of the Congress was illuminated by the figures analysing the ages of delegates. Of 497 writers elected by secret ballot, only three were under the age of thirty, and only sixty-six were between the ages of thirty-one and forty; and there were only thirty-three women. There were 176 of forty-one to fifty years, 188 of fifty-one to sixty, fifty-four of sixty-one to seventy, while ten were over seventy-one. The fear of youth seems evident in these figures, only fourteen per cent of the delegates being under forty-one years and well over half being over fifty. I gather that the breach between the young and the old is further shown in the disinclination of many young writers to join the Union.

I have already touched on my main lines of criticism, but I should like to return to the lack of concreteness in the discussion. As a result there was a lack of an historical outlook, of a Marxist need to penetrate into the essential conflicts and contradictions of the situation, to relate the personal issues and cultural problems to the phase of Soviet development in which the Congress was meeting. There has always been a tendency to lump the whole Soviet period together as a simple struggle of a given socialism with bourgeois survivals. In a very broad way, of course, that is true enough as a description of what has happened since 1917; but it is so general and vague that it is not at all helpful to the writer who needs to know with clarity and fullness exactly what is happening to people, what is the precise form of the dominant tensions

* I discussed Pasternak with several writers and found them ready to argue about *Zhivago* in a conciliatory way. No one denounced it or insisted that it could not have been published; only that the inflated idea provocatively built up about it made it impossible to publish it now — at least for the time being.

and conflicts at any particular moment. A large number of crucial matters, of theory and practice, hinge on the way in which the questions about those tensions and conflicts are posed and answered; and if they are not asked at all, the result is to make discussions over-generalised, cloudy, with an empirical and tangential approach.

And yet, despite this shying-off certain key-points, I felt a new energy, a new birth of creative purpose, leavening the Congress. These positive aspects in turn were linked, as I said at the outset, with the new expansive life of culture in the Republics and with the needs of the people who are vigorously entering the period of the seven-year plan — the people who are showing a keen desire to keep abreast of the world of knowledge and culture in general, in the people's universities which have been created by demand from below; the people who in scores of such ways are expressing their intellectual maturity. The self-criticisms of the Congress must be understood against this background, and then the positive side of the situation becomes clearer; the need of the writers to shake themselves free from outdated forms of organisation and of thought is seen as ever more urgent. Certainly a considerable effort was being made to overcome the weaknesses that the 1954 Congress confronted and to learn from the arguments of the last five years. In 1954, Yashin cogently asked what was the inner censor, the inhibition, holding them all back from the full creative release. In 1959 the inhibition had not been completely broken down, but it clearly was in process of giving way. And the new liberation of creativeness will be on a level incomparably more secure than were the achievements of the 1920s and 1930s; it will possess an organic quality which can only come about stably when the masses have reached a certain point of educational and cultural development.

I have the feeling that the post-war period has seen in the Soviet Union a far more complex set of growing pains than has yet been understood, and that the dislocation and weakening in many of the cultural spheres, which are now being tackled, involved a far larger number of factors than the obvious political ones of Stalin's later years. There was, for instance, precisely the problem of creating a literature far more integrally socialist than had been possible in the 1920s and 1930s when writers had validly carried on many patterns and forms from pre-socialist bases, finding in them an effective way of grappling with the early conflicts of a socialist society. Here it is that the plea of the extreme novelty of the tasks has a real meaning. The disturbances of the war years and the difficulties of Stalin's later period no doubt confused and partly distorted what was thus at stake, but in any event a very complicated and arduous process of growth was going on, which it is now possible to get in something like a clear focus. There are still many difficulties and problems ahead; for there are no easy situations in the task of creating a culture at once original and integrated, solidly based and yet responsive to the colours and shapes of a society rapidly expanding into unprecedented ways. But there is also the huge stimulus of the new possibilities, and I felt in the Congress the intellectual ferment which will nerve men to seek the new forms and images. That, after moments of irritation and disappointment, is the conviction into which my considered view of the Third Congress of Soviet Writers has hardened.

Babel on his Craft

Konstantin Paustovsky

Further instalments of Konstantin Paustovsky's important autobiographical cycle "The Story of My Life" are currently being published in the journal "Oktyabr". The fragment translated below describes a conversation with Isaak Babel near Odessa during the summer of 1921.

ONE evening we were sitting on a stone wall at the edge of the cliff. The gorse was in flower. Babel was absent-mindedly throwing pebbles down the cliff. They bounced down to the sea in giant leaps, hitting the stones with a sound like exploding bullets.

"It's all very well for you and other writers", said Babel, although at that time I was not yet a writer. "You know how to make life sparkle with—what was it you said?—the dew of the imagination. What a sticky-sweet phrase, by the way. But what's a man to do if he has no imagination? Myself, for example."

He fell silent. Below, the sea sighed slowly and sleepily.

"What nonsense you're saying!" I said indignantly.

Babel behaved as if he hadn't heard me. He chucked another pebble and said nothing for a long time.

"I have no imagination", he repeated stubbornly. "I'm saying this in all seriousness. I can't invent. I have to know everything, down to the smallest detail, otherwise I can't write. I've carved a motto on my shield: *Be lifelike*. That's why I write so slowly and so little. I have a very hard time. Every story ages me by several years. Don't talk to me about joyful Mozartian creation, the easy flow of fancy and all the rest of that rubbish. I've written somewhere that I am growing old quickly because of my asthma, the mysterious sickness lodged in my frail body since childhood. All that's a pack of lies. When I write the shortest story I still work at it like a navvy, like a man who's got to shovel away the whole of Everest all by himself. Whenever I start work on one I think it's going to be beyond me. Sometimes I get so tired that I cry. All my blood-vessels ache with fatigue. If a sentence doesn't come, I get cramp in the heart. And how often they refuse to come, damn them!"

"But you write a cast-iron prose", I said. "How do you achieve it?"

"Style, nothing but style", said Babel, and cackled like an old man, imitating somebody, perhaps Moskvina the actor. "Ho, ho, young man! Style, style's the only answer! I'll write you a story about washing clothes and if you like it'll read like the prose of Julius Caesar. It's all a matter of language and style. That, I suppose, is something I can do. But you must understand that it isn't the essence of art but only the building material for it, quality stuff maybe, precious even—I don't know—but still no more than that. There used to be a journalist in Odessa who would say: 'Slip me a couple of ideas and leave it to me, I'll make a masterpiece out of them.' Come along, I'll show you how I go about it. I'm a terrible miser about this sort of thing usually, but for you I'll make an exception."

The *dacha* was in complete darkness. The sea rumbled at the far end of the garden, settling down for the night. Cool air poured into the room from outside, displacing the hot, stuffy air bitter with the scent of wormwood. Babel lit a small lamp. His eyes were red behind his glasses (he was always having trouble with his eyes).

He got out a thick folder of typescript. It contained at least 200 pages.

"Do you know what this is?"

I was at a loss. Could Babel at last have written a long novel and kept it a secret from everyone?

I could not believe it. We all knew the almost telegraphic shortness of his stories, compressed to the extreme limit. We knew that he considered any story longer than ten pages to be watery and diffuse.

Was this really a novel containing 200 pages of Babel's compact prose? Impossible!

I glanced at the first page, saw the title *Lyubka Kazak*, and my surprise grew still greater.

"Forgive me", I said. "I understood *Lyubka Kazak* to be a short story, not yet published. Have you really turned it into a novel?"

Babel put his hand on the typescript and looked at me, smiling. Fine lines gathered at the corners of his eyes.

"Yes", he said, and blushed with embarrassment. "This is *Lyubka Kazak*, a short story, not more than fifteen pages. But here you've got all twenty-two versions of this story, including the final one. The whole manuscript is 200 pages long."

"Twenty-two versions!" I mumbled, understanding nothing.

"Listen", said Babel, beginning to get cross. "Literature isn't got by false pretences. I said twenty-two versions and I mean it. You think that's terrible? Perhaps you think it's too much. Speaking for myself, I'm not even sure that the twenty-second version is fit for printing. I believe it could be compressed still further. And that, my dear friend, is the kind of selective work that produces independent force of language and style.

"Language and style", he repeated. "I take a trifle — a funny story, a scrap of market-place gossip — and out of it I make a thing which I myself can't put down again. It plays. It's round like a pebble on the beach. It's held together by the cohesion of its separate elements. And that force of cohesion is so great that not even lightning can split it apart. It'll be read, that story. And it'll be remembered. People will laugh over it, not because it's funny but because to see human success always makes one want to laugh. I dare to speak of success because there's no one here but you and I. As long as I live you won't breathe a word about this conversation to anyone. Give me your word. Of course it isn't through any merit of mine that the demon of art — or the angel, call it what you like — has entered me, Babel, the son of a petty broker. And I obey it like a slave, like a pack-mule. I've sold my soul to it and I have to write the best prose there is. That's my luck — or my cross. Probably the latter. But take it away and with it the blood will run out of my veins, out of my heart, and I'll be no more than a chewed fag-end. It's work that makes me a man instead of an Odessa street philosopher."

He was silent for a few moments and then said with a fresh access of bitterness: "I haven't any imagination. I have only the thirst to possess it. Remember Blok? 'I see an enchanted shore in the enchanted distance.' Blok reached that shore, but I never shall. My mind is too rational. But I'm grateful that at least I've been granted a longing for that enchanted distance. I work with the last of my strength, I give everything I have, because I want to be present at the feast of the gods and I'm afraid of being turned away."

He took off his glasses and wiped his eyes with the sleeve of his patched grey jacket.

* * *

"And so there it is", said Babel, bending short-sightedly over the manuscript. "I work like a mule. But I'm not complaining. I chose this forced

labour myself. I'm like a galley-slave who's been chained to an oar for life and who ends up by loving that oar — even the patina on it where it's been polished by the palms of his own hands. After many years of contact with human skin even the roughest wood acquires a noble colour and begins to look like ivory. It's the same with words, with the Russian language. Put a warm palm on it and it turns into a living, precious thing.

“But let's stick to one thing at a time. When I write a story down for the first time the manuscript looks dreadful, really bad. It's a collection of a few more or less successful pieces tied together with the dulllest of functional bonds — what's known in the trade as ‘bridges’, a kind of dirty rope. Read the first version of *Lyubka Kazak* and see for yourself. It's a helpless, toothless verbal shambling, a clumsy accumulation of words.

“But that's where the work begins. That's the source. I check sentence after sentence, not once but several times. First I throw out all the useless words. You need a keen eye, because language is a cunning thing, it hides away its rubbish, repetitions, synonyms, plain nonsense. It's as if it were trying to trick us all the time.

“When this work is finished I copy the manuscript out on the typewriter (the text is easier to see that way). Then I leave it to lie for two or three days — if I can hold out that long — and then again I check sentence after sentence. And invariably I again find some weeds and nettles I'd left in. And so every time I copy out the text afresh, and I go on working until even with the most ferocious quibbling I can't find a speck of dirt in the manuscript.

“But that isn't all. Wait! When the muck's been thrown out I check the freshness and precision of all the images, similes and metaphors. If you can't make a comparison that holds, it's best not to make one at all. Let the noun exist by itself in all its simplicity.

“A simile must be precise like a slide-rule and natural like the smell of dill. Oh yes, I forgot — before I throw out the verbal rubbish I break the text up into short sentences. More full stops! Every sentence one thought, one image, no more. I would write this rule into a state law for writers. So don't be afraid of full stops. It may be that my sentences are too short. That's partly because of my chronic asthma. I can't speak long-windedly; I haven't enough breath for it. The longer the sentence, the more acute my shortage of breath.

“I try to banish nearly all the participles and verbal adverbs from my manuscript, leaving only the really essential ones. Participles make speech awkward, cumbersome, and destroy the melody of the language. They bump like tanks going over rubble. Three participles in a sentence — that's murder of the language. All these ‘offering’, ‘accomplishing’, ‘concentrating’, and so on and so forth. The verbal adverb is, after all, lighter than the participle. It even gives a certain winged quality to prose. But if you abuse it your language becomes boneless, a kind of mewing. I think a noun wants only one adjective, the most hand-picked one. Only a genius can afford two adjectives to a noun.

“All paragraphs and punctuation must be correct, but from the point of the maximum effect on the reader, not according to a dead catechism. The paragraph is particularly splendid. It allows you to change rhythm whenever you want, and often, like a flash of lightning, it reveals something familiar to everyone in a completely new light. There are good writers who use punctuation and paragraphing carelessly, and so, in spite of the good quality of their prose, it has a muddy surface suggesting haste and negligence. Andrey Sobol was one of those, and even Kuprin.

“The line in prose must be firm and clean like the line in an engraving.

“The twenty-two versions of *Lyubka Kazak* gave you a fright. All these

versions are a form of weeding, of spinning the story into a single thread. And the result is that the difference between the first version and the last is like the difference between a piece of dirty wrapping paper and Botticelli's *Primavera*."

"You're right", I said. "It really is forced labour. I'll think twenty times before I become a writer."

"But the chief thing", said Babel, "is not to deaden the text in the process of this forced labour. Or else the whole work is fit to be scrapped. It's like tightrope walking.

"Yes, that's just what it's like", he added after another silence.

Translated by Anna Bostock.

RECORD REVIEWS

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra, D Major, Op. 35, P. Tchaikovsky. Valerii Klimov violin. Moscow State Symphony Orchestra, conductor K. Eliasberg. D04302/3.

Caprice, K. Mostras. Variations for Solo Violin, Op. 45, Y. Levitin. **Hungarian Dance No. 8**, J. Brahms. **Etude, Op. 8, No. 11**, A. Scriabin. **Waltz Scherzo, Op. 34**, P. Tchaikovsky. Victor Pikaizen violin, Inna Kollegorskaya piano. D4254/5.

Spanish Songs, I. Nin. Beryl Kimber violin, Branovskaya piano. **Second Sonata**, C. Porter. Joyce Flussler violin, Harriet Wingrien piano. D4266/7.

Romance in D Minor, Op. 6, No. 1, S. Rachmaninov. **Rumanian Folk Dances**, B. Bartok. **Reflections, Op. 32**, A. Glazunov. **Moldavian**

Rhapsody, Op. 47, M. Weinberg. Nina Beilina violin, L. Pecherskaya piano. D 4272/3.

Four Preludes, Op. 34, D. Shostakovich, arr. D. Tsyganov. **Melody, Op. 42, No. 3, Scherzo, Op. 42, No. 2**, P. Tchaikovsky. **Legend, Op. 17**, G. Wieniawski. **Introduction and Rondo Capriccioso, Op. 28**, K. Saint-Saëns. Valentin Zhuk violin, E. Fuchs piano. D4292/3.

Five Melodies, Op. 35 bis, S. Prokofiev. **Melancholy Serenade, Op. 26, Waltz Scherzo, Op. 34**, P. Tchaikovsky. Zorya Shikhmurzaeva violin, E. Fuchs piano. D4300/1.

Fourth Sonata for Violin and Piano in E Minor, W. Mozart. Mark Lubotsky violin, H. Mirvis piano. **Third Sonata Ballad for Violin Solo, D Minor, Op. 27**, E. Ysaye. **Melody, Op. 42**, P. Tchaikovsky. **Polonaise in D Major, Op. 4**, G. Wieniawski. Mark Lubotsky violin, V. Yampolsky piano. D4370/1.

THESE seven recordings of the prize-winners in the violin section of the Tchaikovsky competition held last year in Moscow show the exceptionally high standard of playing of the entrants. It must have been a hard task for the adjudicators to come to a decision on the order of merit of these young contestants; and how lucky they are to find themselves on discs! The winner of the competition, the Russian Klimov, plays Tchaikovsky's Violin Concerto with the Moscow State Symphony Orchestra. He has an impeccable technique, perfect intonation, and a full, seductive, luscious tone.

Coming second in the competition, Pikaizen, a pupil of Oistrakh, plays an unaccompanied Caprice by Mostras (one of the set pieces) and Variation for Solo Violin by Levitin—both interesting and extremely difficult, but played with authority and ease. On the reverse side are Brahms's Hungarian Dance No. 8, a beautiful Scriabin Etude, Op. 8, No. 11, and Tchaikovsky's Waltz Scherzo, Op. 4. His tone is a bit tentative, but he plays with great feeling.

Of special interest to us, because she is well known in this country, is a record of the young Australian Beryl Kimber.

She attained the finals, and won a diploma and a money prize, and is now studying in Moscow with Oistrakh. She plays Nin's Four Spanish Songs with great verve, aplomb and feeling—no tentativeness here. On the other side of the record Joyce Flussler, from the USA, plays an attractive Sonata by Porter. She is an excellent player, who also won a diploma. On another record, Nina Beilina plays Rachmaninov's Romance in D Minor and Bartok's Rumanian Folk Dances, and on the reverse side Glazunov's Reflections, Op. 32, and Weinberg's Moldavian Rhapsody, Op. 47. Especially interesting is prizewinner Zhuk playing Four Preludes by Shostakovich. Some pieces by Tchaikovsky, Legend by Wieniawski and Introduction and Rondo Capriccioso by Saint-Saëns complete the record.

On record No. 6, with a beautiful flowing tone, Zorya Shikhmurzaeva plays some Tchaikovsky pieces and Prokofiev's Five Melodies, Op. 35. The only classical composition, Mozart's Fourth Sonata in E Minor, is persuasively played by Mark Lubotsky.

All these recordings can be borrowed from the SCR, 14 Kensington Square, W.8.

MARJORIE PHILLIPS.

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS

D. N. PRITT, Q.C.

THE Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR was founded in 1924, thirty-five years ago. That is a long time; indeed it is four-sevenths of the life of the Soviet State; and in those thirty-five years the SCR has undergone constant changes, in line with the constant changes in the relations between the Soviet State and the United Kingdom.

But those changes have not affected the one essential function of the SCR. It was founded to build up friendship between our two countries by all means possible in the field of culture; and as culture more and more pervades and influences the whole of society's life it inevitably finds itself, however closely it seeks to confine itself to cultural matters and leave everything that can fairly be called "politics" to others, a part of the whole world effort to build up friendly relations between two great countries and thus to secure the peace of the world.

In those thirty-five years the SCR has often been confronted with situations in which it was easy to make what could later be seen to be mistakes; but I think it can justly claim that all through its life it has kept its objective always in view and served that objective to the best of its ability. While the objective has always been the same, the conditions have varied so much that it must superficially have appeared to be different. What we have always had to do and have always done to the best of our judgment and ability is to deal with each new situation which the changes and chances of international relations have created, in order to secure, by whatever methods were best fitted at the time, the continuance and development of contacts and exchanges between British and Soviet cultural circles — whether scientific, artistic, legal, medical or anything else that fairly comes within the broad scope of "culture" — so that cultural personalities and organisations in each country should know and understand better their opposite numbers in the other country, and that by that means friendships should grow, and service be rendered to peaceful co-existence.

There have been many different phases. When the SCR began its work the Soviet State was still largely unknown to the British people, and there were too many powerful forces working hard to ensure that it should remain unknown — or worse, that people should be misinformed about it. At that time, moreover, only a few far-seeing people had any conception of the immense developments that the new socialist world was to undergo in the years to follow; and the fears and hatreds that were cherished against the young Soviet Republic were directed against it merely because it was socialist, and not because it was strong or potentially strong. The SCR had then to combat mostly ignorance, disbelief and indifference.

Space does not allow me to deal in detail with the many changes which relations between our countries underwent. They were so numerous, whether great or small, swift or gradual, that it is not easy even to recall them all. But the most outstanding, naturally, came after the USSR came into the second world war in 1941. This large-scale change followed a period of particular misunderstanding and quarrel and led not to an immediate but to a very definite improvement in relations. The Society had the interesting task of changing over from a period of hard swimming against a current of hostility to one of keeping pace with a flood of good will and affection and inquiry, and of working hard to meet with innumerable and varied demands for information, visits, lectures, exhibitions, and everything else that could respond to the

sudden appetite of the British public for reliable instruction about this strange new ally — strange because it had been deliberately kept strange. The Society responded to the demand magnificently, and new sections, new activities and new interest sprang up almost overnight, while people of the highest distinction in British culture willingly took part in the work of the Society.

At the end of the war, some people naïvely believed that friendship was founded for good and all, that the SCR had in effect achieved more than half its purpose, and that it had now no need to combat misinformation and unfriendliness but could simply help in supplying contacts and information to two equally friendly and responsive peoples with no one to sow tares and thus impose on the Society the heavy labour of weeding! But the mistake soon became evident as relations were again poisoned; and once again the SCR took up the task of patient explanation, and of rebuilding friendly relations and contacts.

Of late years we have had a new situation of a somewhat different kind. After a generation in which the SCR was working almost alone for good relations with the Soviet Union in the cultural field, we have found ourselves in a new situation, where other organisations have been working on cultural relations with the USSR, sometimes able to achieve by their resources or connections useful results which were outside our scope, and sometimes, of course, not working so directly towards the ultimate goal as we understand it. This new situation is, broadly, a welcome one for us, for it means that on balance more service is rendered to the cause of friendship and of peace than would otherwise be the case; and we have found no difficulty in continuing to give at least as much service to that end as we gave in the earlier years when we worked in that field almost alone.

I feel that all those who in these last thirty-five years have worked with us can look back on their efforts with pride; for always they have been developing friendship through cultural understanding and helping mankind towards that future when the immense benefits of science may be devoted to the abolition of poverty and to the spread of leisure, which in its turn opens before the ordinary man or woman the prospect of a cultured and fruitful use and enjoyment of leisure and the serene life which can derive in peace that rich experience which the cultural achievements of mankind can give to each one of us.

While we thus look back with pride, we still have to look forward with vigilance, determination and—alas!—anxiety. The danger is not yet past, the struggle is by no means over, and we must—as we can—for the time being work as hard as ever to widen and strengthen the cultural bonds between our two great peoples and protect our common heritage of culture against the dangers that threaten it.

THE SOVIET EXHIBITION IN NEW YORK

Murray Young

THE Soviet Exhibition of Science, Technology and Culture, held from June 30 to August 10 in the New York Coliseum, a handsome new hall recently opened on Columbus Circle, proved to be one of the greatest successes of the cultural exchange programme signed between the US and Soviet Governments a year and half ago.

If you had gone at any time during the course of the exhibition you would have seen people from every state in the Union, moving with absorbed attention through the vast reaches of the Coliseum, looking at the displays, talking earnestly to the English-speaking guides. They stood before threshing machines and tractors, before models of automated plants and collective farms, before gleaming, complicated surgical instruments, asking questions and listening to the guide's explanations.

Not since the World Fair in 1939-40, at which the Soviet pavilion housed one of the most striking exhibits, have Americans had the opportunity to see a large display of Soviet life and achievement. Twenty crowded and difficult years had passed, and now here again, superbly presented, was another opportunity.

The visitor stepped from the entrance into a segment of outer space where, gleaming above his head, were sputniks I, II and III, complete with equipment and instrumentation. To his left, towering above the sputniks, a heroic figure in bronze—of a young Soviet worker beating his sword into a ploughshare—proclaimed the works of peace.

After this spectacular introduction the visitor proceeded from display to display, each presenting an accomplishment of Soviet life, either actual machines and instruments or working models. The skilful use of cinema and television screens and of enlarged photographs, graphs and charts, and the ingenious use of scale models of automated machinery, electrically controlled airfields and the atomic-powered ice-breaker, the *Lenin*, impressively set before the visitor the range and quality of Soviet technological development.

The displays of the peaceful use of atomic energy, electronics and automation probably left the non-specialist rather bewildered even though simplified charts and models helped to make clear to him the underlying principles involved in these processes. But the display of foodstuffs, fabrics, handicrafts, furs, perfumes and clothing received the closest scrutiny by most visitors, who, out of their depth before machine tools with programme-control devices and automatic measuring instruments, felt that they could see the pattern of Soviet life a little more clearly through inspection of their food and clothing.

Nor did the display of the latest Soviet cars—the Chaika, the ZIL-III, the Volga and the small station-wagon Moskvich—escape close inspection. Visitors found the amount of chromium on the cars, their two-toned bodies and the fish-tail fenders on the ZIL-III not at all what they had expected.

One of the most popular attractions was the fashion show in which young Soviet models, slim and exquisitely featured, displayed sports and beach wear, day and evening dresses, furs and accessories to the strains of a trio playing

MURRAY YOUNG is managing editor of *New World Review*, published in New York. His article was commissioned when he passed through London on his return from a visit to the USSR.

popular tunes, and capped each show by throwing to the delighted audience flowers from the bouquets they carried.

What particularly pleased visitors was the chance to talk to the guides, not only as experts prepared to answer every sort and kind of question, but simply as representatives of that vast country about which Americans are increasingly curious. Unfailingly good-humoured, the guides' friendliness made possible a "people-to-people" contact that many found a high point of the exhibition. For two weeks in July at Madison Square Garden, a company of 200 Soviet singers and dancers repeated the triumphs of the Bolshoi Ballet Company which this spring took the audiences at the Metropolitan Opera House by storm. Some 14,000 people each night, carried beyond themselves by the colour, vigour and infectious warmth of the performances, thunderously applauded and cheered the artists representing the many nationalities that make up the Soviet Union.

The Press gave much space to the exhibition, treating the high level of the scientific and technological sections seriously and expressing admiration for the skill and brilliance with which the exhibits had been arranged. Questions, of course, were raised about what was called the "Utopian" aspect of the sections dealing with housing, food and clothing. Several "experts" were called upon to prove that the whole thing was a sheer fantasy. But the fashion show remained crowded and there was no dissenting voice raised about the magnificent singers and dancers at Madison Square Garden.

The Soviet-American cultural and scientific exchange agreement signed in January 1958 has been responsible for important exchanges. The American National Exhibition (the USA counterpart of this Soviet exhibition in New York) opened in Moscow in late July. Vice-President Richard M. Nixon represented the US Government and made the official opening speech. Here in New York the Soviet Exhibition was formally opened by First Deputy Premier Frol R. Kozlov of the Soviet Union, while Mr. Nixon represented the US administration.

President Eisenhower flew to New York unexpectedly to visit the exhibition the day before it opened. After inspecting the displays, the President, drinking a glass of champagne with Mr. Kozlov, proposed its success. In response to his admiration for several of the paintings, a picture he had particularly liked was sent him as a gift. It now hangs in a prominent place in the White House. Another painting was presented to Mr. Nixon.

In his speech at the opening of the exhibition Mr. Kozlov frankly stated the Soviet position:

There . . . exist, in our opinion, objective possibilities to develop . . . economic ties between the USA and the Soviet Union. We both stand to learn from one another. We pay tribute to the United States as a technically highly developed country. You, however, are aware that today the Soviet Union has also achieved great successes in the sphere of technical progress. We have now launched plans for the further economic development of our country. The Soviet people have undertaken the task not only to catch up with but, let me say outright, to surpass you in the not too distant future, both as regards the overall volume of output of peaceful production and in *per capita* production.

This, then, is the "Soviet challenge" of which so much has lately been said and written in the West, our intention often being distorted in the process, which we sincerely regret. But this challenge of ours is not a call to armed struggle. We want to compete for our country to become more prosperous, ~~for~~ our people to live a better life, for them to be better fed and clothed, to have more homes, to be able to satisfy more fully their spiritual requirements. Do these intentions of ours threaten anyone? All the nations of the world, including the Soviet and American peoples, can only stand to gain as a result of this sort of competition and challenge."

Mr. Nixon, in welcoming Mr. Kozlov, had said :

We do not expect this great exhibition and your visit here or our exhibition in Moscow and my visit there to resolve the basic differences which exist between our governments. But I know that you will agree with me when I say that these events do provide a unique opportunity to reduce to an extent misunderstandings which exist between our people and our governments and thereby to further the cause of peace to which we are both dedicated.

In that spirit we hope that thousands of Americans will visit this exhibition so that they may see at first hand the achievements of the Russian people. . . .

Mr. Nixon's wish that thousands of Americans would see the exhibition was more than fulfilled. Indeed, the popularity of the exhibition and the seriousness with which its displays were inspected by hundreds of thousands of Americans (attendance is said to have averaged 40,000 each day) would indicate that a new stage is developing in US-USSR relations based upon a more realistic estimate of the world situation. At least to a great many of the visitors, Mr. Kozlov's words at the opening must have made good sense:

There is no need to conceal that we have different social systems, and that our views on many international issues often do not coincide. But we do live on one planet and, therefore, no one from any "other world" will resolve the questions of our inter-relationships for us. The affairs of the earth should be solved by people who live on the earth.

SCR Library

***Thousands of books and journals
in English and Russian available
for reference and on loan***

***Research and information
services***

***Hours: Monday, Tuesday and
Wednesday 1-7 p.m., Thursday
and Friday 1-6 p.m.***

CONDUCTORS' IMPRESSIONS

In the past winter Soviet conductor Kyril Kondrashin visited London for the second time, for the Tchaikovsky Festival, while Nikolai Malko, well known to London concert-goers, went to Moscow from Australia for a series of concerts. In these articles each gives his impressions of his visit, Kondrashin specially for the "Anglo-Soviet Journal" and Malko from "Sovetskaya Muzyka".

THE LONDON TCHAIKOVSKY FESTIVAL

Kiril Kondrashin

THERE were eight of us who set off for the Tchaikovsky Festival in London: E. Gilels, L. Kogan, M. Rostropovich, G. Vishnevskaya, the accompanists A. Mytnik and A. Dedyukhin, and the conductors Ivanov and myself. This was probably the first time that a London festival had been arranged exclusively devoted to the works of the great Russian composer, and the public and Press, therefore, were deeply interested, which added greatly to our responsibility.

Though P. I. Tchaikovsky is undoubtedly popular in England, many of his works are rarely played there. That is why the London public's knowledge of him is limited in the main to his symphonies, symphonic poems and overtures ("Romeo and Juliet", "Francesca da Rimini", etc.), the highly popular First Piano Concerto, the violin concertos and the "Rococo" variations. In view of this we deliberately included such of the master's works rarely heard in England as his Third Suite, Second Piano Concerto, and symphonic ballade "Voyevoda". It was impossible, of course, to present the whole of Tchaikovsky's works in four symphony concerts, and a number of his great compositions, both popular and less known, could not be performed.

From my talks with some music critics I was left with the impression that a certain section of the musicians of England regard Tchaikovsky as somewhat "old-fashioned", as an excessively sentimental and one-sided composer. Talking to me, one of these critics expressed his doubts as to the wisdom of arranging a special festival devoted to Tchaikovsky, since this composer, in his view, was unable to develop his themes sufficiently and owed his charm entirely to his catching melodies. He was surprised when I cited the words of our great music critic Sollertinsky, who measured the post-Beethoven development of world symphonic music by the symphonies of Brahms, Tchaikovsky and Mahler. It seems to me that the rather "snobbish" views expressed on Tchaikovsky by this critic resulted from insufficient knowledge of the composer's work as a whole.

The public, for its part, displayed considerable interest, warmly receiving all the works performed, including those little known. But the Press, I thought, did not show sufficient understanding of such an important work as the Third Suite. The music critics were unable to sense the full depth and psychological wealth of this composition, comparable to the finest symphonies of the composer.

A great deal of energy was put into the festival by Mr. Ian Hunter, whose kind attention and care we felt everywhere and every day. The London Philharmonic Orchestra played very well indeed at every concert. I should add that we are accustomed to more rehearsals with the orchestra and that it was not easy to prepare a programme with only two rehearsals, especially of works rarely performed. The orchestra and the arrangers of the concerts, however,

coped with this difficulty with honour, though the musicians often had to rehearse longer than the specified time. It was all the more thrilling to feel our close contact with both orchestra and public during the performances.

Our rehearsals, too, were of constant interest to a number of musicians, composers and music students who were always present.

During the two weeks of the festival we had occasion to talk to many British musicians. Nor did we meet them at the official receptions alone. It was a great pleasure to receive many invitations from famous artists and composers, to visit them in their homes and meet them at our concerts. We were sorry only that there was not enough time to accept all the invitations. During these get-togethers there were often lively discussions on the role of **art, and the importance of one composer or another**; and I may add that our views on æsthetic problems were not far apart as a rule.

There was not enough time, unfortunately, to acquaint ourselves more fully with the musical life of London. What little we heard and saw, however, attested to its intensiveness and richness. We can only hope that our future guest performances will be arranged in such a way as to leave us more time for a closer look at the concerts and museums.

It seems to me that the Tchaikovsky Festival was well worth while. And most important, it has helped to develop contacts between our countries and multiply the number of our friends. I am sure that this in turn will put more and more people in mind of the need for the mutual enrichment of culture.

I should like to thank all our British friends for our joint artistic endeavour, and for their help. I sincerely hope, too, that in the near future we shall have the pleasure of seeing and hearing them in the USSR at evenings specially devoted to British music, as well as at other concerts.

* * *

CONCERT TOUR IN THE USSR

Nikolai Malko

TO READ about musical and theatrical life is one matter; to see and hear for yourself is quite another. I was struck by the quality of two ballet performances in Kiev; everything about them — both the stage and orchestra — was of a high standard. It is really amazing how all this could have been achieved in the absence of “time-honoured” traditions. The ballet *Don Quixote* showed me, to my surprise, that Pugini was by no means such a bad ballet composer.

It was extremely interesting to see Khachaturyan’s ballet *Spartacus* in Leningrad. The orchestra easily overcame the difficulties of the score, and gave a very good performance. There was once a time when languid and sluggish playing on the part of the orchestra was a “tradition” of ballet. Napravnik used to tell me how when he was sitting beside Tchaikovsky at a rehearsal of the new *Nutcracker* ballet he was infuriated by the playing of the orchestra. The conductor was Ricardo Drigo — a first-rate musician and a good conductor, yet such a dear old thing; he was an absolute slave to everything that went on on the stage. As a result the orchestra gave one of those performances which has become traditional in ballet, where the meaning of the musical performance was sacrificed to the convenience, or basic lack of musical feeling, of the dancers.

At length, Napravnik said to Tchaikovsky: “You should go up and tell him off.” During the interval, Tchaikovsky made his way, with some reluctance, on to the stage. He returned, quivering. Napravnik let him be

for a while, and then inquired: "Well, did you go?" "Yes." "What did you tell him?" "I—I—thanked him."

On several occasions I managed to get to the dramatic theatres, the puppet theatre, and the theatre of satire. I did not go to the opera — one cannot get everywhere and I had to do some conducting myself. I shall say something about this now.

The Kiev Philharmonic Orchestra made a very gratifying impression on me with its quality and its work. Within a short time it demonstrated an ability to "switch over" to different styles from Beethoven and Mozart, by way of Brahms, Wagner and Tchaikovsky, to Debussy and Ravel. In its rendering of Ravel's suite *Daphnis and Chloe* the orchestra showed real virtuosity.

In Moscow, I conducted the USSR State Orchestra and the Moscow Philharmonic Orchestra. Each has its own artistic character and great artistic qualities. I must speak guardedly about a performance which I conducted, but I am justified in saying that the State Orchestra performed Brahms in true Brahms fashion, and that the Philharmonic Orchestra performed Shostakovich's First Symphony with the delicate precision of a chamber orchestra.

By the way, I was amazed, in the final bar of the introduction to the first part of the symphony, to hear the violas play an A flat instead of the usual G. Since this had been "corrected" in the score, we began to make further inquiries. The composer was away from Moscow. After much investigation, we concluded that he had altered this note, which has also been inserted into the latest edition of the score. Perhaps. We played it as amended, yet I was sorry for the sake of the music, to which my ear had grown so accustomed. Once Glazunov recommended that a B in the oboe part (fifth bar) be altered to B flat. Steinberg advised that the piano solo at the end of the second part be cut out. The composer did not "lend himself" to these counsels. Where did this change in the viola part, which has destroyed the innocent polytonality of this bar, come from?

Leningrad. A wonderful orchestra, wonderful to work with. Among the great qualities of this orchestra I shall single out its artistic "breathing". There is no other way of describing the rhythmic and prosodic modulation, which is a sign of a really high level of performance. In great measure, of course, the honour for this belongs to Evgeny Mravinsky, and I have written to him about it.

Finally, but not last in importance, my meeting with my pupils. It gave me enormous joy to meet my old pupils, as well as to discover that all of them are honourably carrying out their great creative tasks, some as conductors — Mravinsky, Melik-Pashaev, Khaikin, Pokrovsky (in Odessa), Sherman (who is now preparing the Karelian Ten Day National Art Festival), Dubovskoi, Lyubarsky — and others as professors of classes for conductors and orchestras, and as directors of studios — Musin, Rabynovich, Ginzburg, Kanershtein, Taranov. I have by no means mentioned all of them. I was overjoyed and deeply excited by my meeting with them. In conclusion, I should like to express warm gratitude to all those who made my artistic work in the Soviet Union a pleasure — first to the Ministry of Culture, to *Goskontzert* (which organises concert tours), and the orchestras with whom I had occasion to work, and then to all those who showed me such great hospitality and gave me such friendly help.

Sovetskaya Muzyka No. 6, 1959. Translated by M. Lavery.

THE MOSCOW ART THEATRE SCHOOL

E. A. Saddlemayer

In the Christmas vacation of 1958, a Canadian student working in the British Isles on the history of the theatre joined an Intourist opera and ballet tour in Moscow in order to see something of Soviet theatre and theatre training. This article describes what she found.

A SMALL gold badge bearing the sweeping outline of a seagull white above grey sky and sea — to the world a familiar symbol representing one of the most revolutionary movements in twentieth-century theatre, to me a personal token as well of a dream fulfilled.

It is over a year since the Moscow Art Theatre visited London. Much has been written (and no doubt not a little forgotten) about their successful and simulating invasion of London's self-centred and complacent dramatic circle. This is the record of their impression on a drama student from Canada, and the result of that unforgettable experience. The performances I attended at Sadler's Wells both excited and disturbed me. I had read Stanislavsky's books and had a general knowledge of the history of Russian theatre; yet here was well-known material presented in a manner familiar yet strangely different, vivid and yet confusing. And so I decided that somehow, some time, I would go to Moscow and see for myself how it was done.

Six months later I was travelling by train across Europe on my way to join an Intourist music and drama festival in Moscow. Well-meaning friends had warned me that the climate would be difficult and the journey long, but in fact, as the train made its way through the Polish countryside, I could have been travelling home for Christmas. I was to discover much more that was strangely familiar before I returned.

On my arrival in Moscow, arrangements were immediately made by Mr. Tikhomirov, of the USSR-Great Britain Society, for me to visit the Moscow Art Theatre School. With me were two other members of our tour, a director studying production in Sweden and a young actor studying drama in England, both Americans. Our visit began with a tour of the Art Theatre museum, where, through records of former productions, we had an opportunity to trace the development of the theatre and its technique. We saw a model of the shed used for its first rehearsals, photographs of the original productions, sketches and models of set designs, souvenirs of actors and producers (including the dresses worn by Madame Chekhov in *The Cherry Orchard*). Great names passed in review: Chekhov, Gorky, Tolstoi, Ibsen, Maeterlinck, Gogol, Ostrovsky, Turgenev, Ivanov, Beaumarchais, Molière, Shakespeare, and Shaw. The restless search for new methods, the famous meeting between Stanislavsky and Nemirovich-Danchenko, the close collaboration with Chekhov and Gorky, Gordon Craig's production of *Hamlet*, and countless other landmarks, sprang to life as we walked from room to room.

Next we were shown into the bright, comfortable office of the director of the school, Mr. Rodomyslensky. For two hours he patiently answered our questions and explained the organisation and teaching methods of the school. Much of what he said applied in practice to the Art Theatre itself, and one was left with an impression not only of a carefully planned school and theatre but of a highly organised cultural element, its influence extending beyond drama to attempt Stanislavsky's dream of a union of the arts, and a reflection of the nation in their art.

The Moscow Art Theatre School was one of many, Mr. Rodomyslensky

explained. Thirteen theatrical schools and at least thirty studios (on a less advanced level) were active at the present time. In general aim and organisation they operated on lines similar to his. The Art Theatre School, founded by Stanislavsky and Nemirovich-Danchenko, adhered as closely as possible to the "system" originally developed by Stanislavsky himself. All teachers and directors were disciples, some of them had been students, of Stanislavsky; and although his methods (as expounded in *My Life in Art* and *An Actor Prepares*) have been further developed and refined as teaching methods they closely follow his basic aim — the presentation on the stage of a living organic character. Mr. Rodomyslensky compared this method with the task of a watchmaker: "It is more a process of synthesis than analysis; first you must disengage all the parts and perfect them, then you reassemble them into a smoothly working unit"; and he illustrated his remarks with eloquent gestures.

He went on to describe the application of this method to teaching. Concentration is equally divided between "inner" and "outer" technique. If the actor sincerely attempts to re-create and *live* the role the outward physical technique should correspond to and reflect the emotions and attitudes of the character he is creating; similarly, every gesture and outward movement must coincide with the actor's *image* of his character. The actor *becomes* the character. The director's duty is to work with the actor, first educating him, then helping him to realise his individual abilities to create. The course of study is divided into three general sections: emphasis on perfecting this "inner psychology" of the characters; discipline in the various facets of the actor's art (scenic movements, mime, speech, breathing, fencing, dancing, acrobatics, etc.); and, of equal importance, enlarging the culture and education of the student so that he becomes familiar with and understands the other arts.

From general theory Mr. Rodomyslensky passed on to a discussion of the organisation of the school. There are at present sixty-eight teachers and 130 students, a happy ratio of two students to each teacher. The course takes four years to complete. There is a separate faculty for stage designers and directors; students interested in teaching and directing are required to train for four years more. The average age of applicants is between seventeen and twenty years, and, once accepted, the students live in hostels with their teachers and are completely supported by the State. In order to qualify for entrance, students must have entrance diplomas, which means that they have already completed at least ten years of secondary school education, and successfully passed three examinations. As only twenty-five applicants are accepted each year out of 1,200 to 1,800 candidates, competition is unusually keen. Each year special committees are sent throughout the Soviet Union, auditioning prospective candidates. All take the first examination, those showing sufficient talent are then examined once more, and finally there is a third competition for the twenty-five scholarships available. Approximately sixty per cent of the students come from outside Moscow.

The students have their own theatre at the school, with two stages, which they staff themselves. Six or seven plays are produced a year, chosen by a literary committee in conjunction with the main director. The repertoire is carefully chosen to give the students as much varied experience as possible, and I noticed that among the plays produced this year were Ibsen's *A Doll's House*, Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest*, Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*, Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*, and several contemporary European plays. As Stanislavsky's method is fundamentally realistic, experimental plays are rarely done.

The school gains much from its proximity to the Art Theatre; most of the teachers perform on the MAT stage, and the student directors have the

advantage of watching the professional directors of the MAT (there are at present eight major directors and five or six younger ones).

And after their course is finished, what then? Apparently very few gain entrance to the Art Theatre; in general they tend to disperse among the many theatres in Moscow and other centres; quite a few go into film work. At this statement, our interpreter showed considerable interest; we later discovered that her husband is a young film director in Moscow.

Conversation then turned to the playwright. There is a faculty of dramaturgy in the Institute of Literature which, Mr. Rodomyslensky remarked with the professional actor's slightly superior smile, doubtless caters for their needs. He added that generally the writers tended to gravitate towards those theatres which were most compatible with their own tastes and techniques; entrance to the theatres was usually gained through the theatre directors.

Although it was Saturday afternoon, classes were in session, and the director conducted us through the school itself. After peeping into several classrooms where small groups of students assiduously took notes from earnest lecturers, we paused at a door through which the faint sounds of a piano could be heard. A dancing class was in progress, and we were invited to watch five serious young couples being put through their paces. Concentrating intently on their steps and the instructor's rhythmic tapping, all seemed oblivious of our presence — except for one superbly self-confident young man who could have barely been seventeen. As I watched his graceful movements and proud carriage, I wondered whether his destination would be the professional theatre next door or the cinema.

Our tour was now over and, politely but rather nervously declining an invitation to participate in the fencing lesson which followed, we were whisked off by our energetic interpreter to the next event on our busy schedule. As souvenirs of our visit we took with us the small gold badge of the Moscow Art Theatre, presented to us by our friend Mr. Rodomyslensky.

The remainder of my visit to Moscow became a kaleidoscope of theatre, colour, impressions, as I tried to cram the culture and life of a large modern cosmopolitan city into a few days. Our programme of events advertised performances at thirty-two theatres, and each theatre offered an average of five different performances in one week. It being impossible to taste thoroughly of such a varied and appealing bill of fare, I decided to sample as many different dishes as I could, rushing from the Bolshoi Theatre to the renowned puppet theatre, from the Stanislavsky and Nemirovich-Danchenko musical theatre to the Mayakovsky and Maly filial theatres. Everywhere I went the theatres were crowded, with a majority of young people in the audience actively participating and enjoying what was offered them.

My general impression largely corroborated what we had learned during our visit to the Moscow Art Theatre School. There appeared to be little departure from tradition. The standard of production was exceptionally high, and the superb and imaginative use of stage machinery was delightful to watch. This was especially true of Mayakovsky's *The Bed Bug*, produced at the Mayakovsky Theatre by Okhlopkov. Applied to the ballet, this refinement of stage technique and machinery provided even more enjoyment, as a visit to *Swan Lake* at the Stanislavsky and Nemirovich-Danchenko Musical Theatre proved. How great the resulting danger of too much dependence on machinery and technique to the detriment of the text and subtle intellectual effects was impossible to tell on such a short visit. I noticed with some surprise that there was less emphasis on coloured lighting than we are accustomed to, and this, perhaps, is a good thing.

An additional interest was the simultaneous visit to Moscow of theatre and ballet companies from the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic. Here was an

opportunity to compare not only provincial with Moscow standards, but a similar situation in my own country, where the cultural centre is a great distance from many smaller, partially isolated, communities. Several years ago I had seen a film of the Bolshoi company in Asafiev's *Fountain of Bakhchisarai*. Now, on the Bolshoi stage, with the same staging and scenery, I watched the youthful Kazakh company's interpretation of the same ballet. Although it lacked some of the polish of the more experienced company, there was a life and vigour — perhaps even a slight oriental tone — which had not been there before, and which strongly reminded me of the folk dances I had seen in Slavonic communities on the Canadian prairies. I felt a keen sympathy with this troupe which had brought its own culture and individuality from such a great distance — five days' journey by train. I could sympathise, too, with its necessary self-sufficiency and enthusiasm. Once again I felt the familiar strength which develops in communities where the folk are still close to the soil and dependent on each other.

This familiarity in strange surroundings swept over me as I wandered about the streets of Moscow, joined the crowds window-shopping in the large department stores, smiled at the mothers out in the parks with their children on Sunday. And mingled with it were the thrill of touring the Kremlin, amazement at the efficiency of our charming interpreter (tempered only rarely with bewilderment, as when *The Cricket on the Hearth* was metamorphosed into *The Grasshopper on the Stove*), the excitement of a bustling, thronging metropolis, and the desire to visit Moscow again.

I had visited Moscow because of the Art Theatre; I left it recalling these words of Konstantin Stanislavsky:

What a joy it is to live in close contact with your own people. What a joy it would be for people to live in close contact with each other, with all the peoples of the world, from the North Pole to the South Pole, with the peoples of all islands and continents.

It has become clear that wars must stop and that instead of them the nations will be sending one another their writers, their theatre companies, their paintings, their orchestras, their choirs, their amateur art, their scientific inventions and discoveries, their sports teams to display their prowess and athletic exploits. Such are the weapons, wars and mobilisation of the future of mankind.

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF SOVIET CRIMINAL LEGISLATION

Boris S. Nikiforov

Dr. Nikiforov is head of the criminal law sector of the USSR Institute of Juridical Sciences and the author of several works on Soviet criminal law. He is the editor of the Russian translation of Kenny's "Outline of Criminal Law", and has recently published a monograph on Indian criminal law. Dr. Nikiforov will be lecturing on Soviet criminal law later this year at several British universities. This article, discussing the revision of Soviet criminal legislation, was specially written for the "Anglo-Soviet Journal".

NOT many people today think that law develops by itself, irrespective of changes in the conditions of social life. Its content is determined by the nature of social relations, which are regulated and safeguarded by law. To satisfy oneself that this is so it is only necessary to compare the Old Testament commandments or the Roman tables with the highly developed legislation of a modern state.

Nor does law stand still during the course of development of a state of a particular historical type. While remaining unchanged with respect to its principles and final aims, it will change its content and form considerably, depending on the concrete conditions of the historical period.

This holds true for Soviet law too, in particular for criminal law. An excellent illustration of this is the new federal law — Principles of Criminal Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics — passed by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on December 25, 1958.

In preparing the draft law the Supreme Soviet's commissions on legislative proposals proceeded from the proposition that, as the country continues developing economically and the well-being of the people rises accordingly, and with people understanding their social duty more deeply, education and persuasion become increasingly more important, while compulsion — and in the conditions prevailing in our country it can only be legal compulsion — is used within narrower limits and in milder forms than before. Socialist legality is at the same time further strengthened.

There is no need to prove that these principles are of great importance for criminal law, the most pronounced form of compulsion by law.

The narrowing and relaxing of penal repression is expressed in the new law, above all, by further limiting the death penalty, the severest form of punishment, and lowering the maximum length of penalties involving serving a term of years, and by limiting the category of persons who may be dealt criminal punishment.

Under the new fundamentals the death penalty will be imposed for murder only where such aggravating circumstances are present as are specified in the sections of the law defining liability for this crime. For the first time in Soviet criminal legislation the fundamentals list the acts for which the law envisages the possibility of imposing the death penalty. It constitutes a complete list for the legislatures of the Union Republics.

Reduction of the maximum length of sentences is most clearly reflected in the sphere of deprivation of liberty and exile. Under the legislation previously in force, deprivation of liberty could be for a term of twenty, or even twenty-five, years; and such terms were provided in the law not only for political offences which in point of fact are not met with in practice, but also for some relatively

common acts, such as certain crimes against the person and property. This circumstance has, of course, exerted a certain influence on the actual mean term of deprivation of liberty by court sentence. Under the new law the term of deprivation of liberty is fixed at ten years, and only for particularly grave crimes, and for especially dangerous recidivists, does the law fix longer terms, not exceeding fifteen years.

Does this merely mean that courts may no longer sentence a person to deprivation of liberty for longer than ten years, and in certain cases to fifteen? No, not only that.

The Fundamentals of Criminal Legislation have served as a basis for the huge task of preparing new criminal codes for the Union Republics. Some of the republics, the Uzbek and Azerbaijan, for instance, have already adopted their new codes. The lowering of the maximum term of deprivation of liberty in the fundamentals means, of course, that in the republican codes, too, the maximum terms of deprivation of liberty will be considerably lower for the bulk of criminal acts. This also means that parallel with it there will be a greater proportion of penalties not involving deprivation of liberty, such as corrective labour without deprivation of liberty, and penalties not involving serving time, such as a fine or a public reprimand.

Here an observation of importance to British readers should be added. The term "*lisheniye svobody*" used in Soviet criminal law is often translated into English as "imprisonment". That, however, is not a correct translation. As far as most of those sentenced to deprivation of liberty are concerned it actually means confinement in a corrective labour colony, and as to minors, confinement in a labour colony for minors; under the new law imprisonment, in the strict meaning of the term, may be applied only to persons who have committed a grave crime, or to particularly dangerous recidivists. In the great majority of cases, even under these conditions, it is provided for only part of the term of deprivation of liberty to be served.

Even with such a stern punishment as exile the maximum term has been halved, from ten years to five. In addition, the law underscores that persons who are under eighteen when they commit a crime may not be sentenced to exile or deportation, and that pregnant women, or women with children under eight years of age dependent on them, may not be sentenced to exile.

The new law *has raised the age of criminal liability*. Under the old law, in cases of crimes against the person accompanied by violence, and of theft, liability could attach at twelve and in other cases at fourteen. Under the new law liability for certain crimes, mainly those just mentioned, attaches only where the offender has reached the age of fourteen. For all other crimes liability attaches only after sixteen. Moreover, should the court find that an individual who has committed a crime which does not constitute a serious social danger could be reformed without applying the penalty provided by the law, it may apply measures of a compulsory educative character that are not criminal punishment. These measures are fixed by the legislation of Union Republics. It is to be expected that they will include turning the minor over to supervision by his parents, guardians, or other relatives, or by an agency of public education or a public organisation, or placing him in a special medical treatment educational institution or in a children's educational colony.

Under Soviet criminal law a penalty is not merely punishment for a crime committed; it also has the purpose of correcting and re-educating those convicted and of preventing other crimes. For instance, if a person sentenced to deprivation of liberty could be freed after serving, say, one-fifth of the term of his sentence the penalty would lose a good deal of its punitive force. However, it would be absurdly rigorous to require the convict to serve the full sentence even though, after serving a considerable part of it, he had

shown by his conduct that he had definitely reformed. A punishment which is only penal retribution cannot, as a general rule, be just, any more than can a "punishment" from which penal retribution is totally absent.

Proceeding from the proposition that a penalty must not only be a punitive measure, but also expedient from the standpoint of humaneness, the 1954 law provided that persons who had served not less than two-thirds of the term to which they were sentenced could be paroled. The new fundamentals have introduced important changes in the solution of this question. For the majority of convicts they make the minimum to be served one-half of the term to which they were sentenced, leaving the provision of the 1954 law to be applied only to persons who have committed grave crimes. Where a convict has served the minimum term of his sentence, and has shown by good behaviour and a sincere attitude towards work that he has reformed, the court may release him on parole or commute the unserved part of the sentence to a milder penalty. This provision does not apply, however, to particularly dangerous recidivists.

It may be asked whether these changes in Soviet criminal legislation do not mean a relaxation of the struggle against crime, or whether they may not lead to it in practice. No, in no sense, and under no circumstances. I would say that they should be regarded rather as a component of measures aimed at *intensifying* the fight against crime which, as we progress, becomes more and more an intolerable survival of the past. The point is that we do not regard, and never have regarded, punishment as the sole means of combating crime, and not even the chief means. In this respect the greater well-being of the people, the development of culture, more educational work and the growth of social consciousness are very important. The changes in legislation mentioned before should be considered against the background of the great achievements of the Soviet Union in all these directions. It is no accident that the narrowing and reduction of the province of compulsion under criminal law coincide in time with these achievements. They can serve as proof of the progress the Soviet people have made in governmental, economic and cultural development.

Important too is the following consideration. In the new conditions the well-known principle that the preventive value of a punishment is not its severity but its inevitability is becoming ever more appropriate. The changes in our criminal legislation mentioned above have become possible and necessary because we have succeeded in recent years in sharply improving the work of investigation agencies and the courts. We want them to be guided by the rule — a rule to which there are no exceptions — that anyone who has committed a crime shall be found out and punished in accordance with the degree of his guilt, but that no innocent person shall suffer.

It should also be borne in mind that, along with cutting the terms of sentences involving deprivation of liberty, a radical reorganisation is under way, for example, of the work of the institutions in which sentences are served. In the work of these institutions, primarily the corrective labour colonies, which have replaced the earlier camps, the educational element has been greatly heightened. And it is a very encouraging fact, a fact proved in practice, that in this way we usually manage effectively to correct criminal offenders in a short time, which we previously did not always succeed in doing by imposing a long term of deprivation of liberty.

I say "usually", because so far we have not taken into consideration that there are relapses and recidivists, and the interests of society demand a stern struggle against them. It should not be forgotten that socialist humanism in criminal law is not simply the *minimum* repression or the *maximum* mildness in repression. Socialist humanism in criminal law is such *minimum* and *mild* repression as is compatible with the protection of society and members of

society — Soviet citizens — against crime and criminals. Therefore, where, from this point of view, more vigorous measures have to be taken, such measures should absolutely be taken. This is the reason for the provisions in the fundamentals covering particularly dangerous recidivists. It is indicative that there are few of these, or like, provisions in the new legislation, and, what is more important, that they are directed against the small groups of people who follow the path of committing a number of crimes.

Earlier I said that along with narrowing the province of compulsion a further strengthening of socialist law was going on. This is due in the first place to the fact that legality is a principle of socialist law and order. And this, in turn, stems from the fact that the socialist state regards the law as an important means for consolidating, developing and safeguarding socialist social relations. Soviet law is a means the socialist state uses to solve the problems facing it. And when Mr. David Floyd, in his review of the new Soviet legislation published some time ago in the *Daily Telegraph*, lamentably stated that “Soviet law still serves the State” this statement could only make one smile, for all systems of law differ from one another not in that some serve and others do not serve a corresponding state, but in *what* state they serve, whether the state is based on the private ownership of the means of production or on public socialist ownership of the basic instruments and means of production.

The policy of narrowing repression creates a social atmosphere in which every criminal punishment is regarded in a certain sense as an exception to the rule, or, if you will, as something like an extraordinary event. Yet, as is known, in a civilised state any exception to the rule and out-of-the-usual measures are regulated by law more strictly than the rules themselves.

Be that as it may, the line embodied in the new fundamentals is one of further strengthening legality. On this score the reader’s attention is directed to Article 3 of the new law, the position of which in the chapter on “General Provisions” underlines its fundamental importance. This article secures by legislation what has long become the practice, and for this reason it may not attract special attention. However, the importance of the principles it embodies is not lessened thereby.

Article 3 reads: “Criminal liability attaches, and punishment for the crime shall be meted out, only to one guilty of the commission of a crime, that is one who deliberately or through carelessness has committed a socially dangerous act envisaged by the criminal law.” Highly important political and legal conclusions follow from this formulation: it is the embodiment by legislation of the abandonment of recourse to repression irrespective of whether a concrete crime has been committed and, in connection therewith, the abandonment of “social defence measures”; at the same time it seals the abandonment of the institution of application of the criminal law “by analogy”.

The conditions obtaining during the early years of Soviet government, namely the continuing sharp class struggle, the existence of a class of kulaks and remnants of the other exploiting classes, the material incompleteness of legislation, and so on, pre-determined the inclusion in the Soviet criminal law of those years of decisions permitting repression — “social defence measures” — not only against persons committing a socially dangerous act but also against persons who were socially dangerous because of their connections with criminal elements or of past activity. These were the conditions which gave rise to the institution of analogy, under which, when a concrete socially dangerous act was committed, the person who committed the act could be punished not only where the act was expressly envisaged by the law but also

where it was not expressly envisaged, in other words where it was provided for in a general way.

The law, court practice and the theory of criminal law, of course, placed definite limitations on the application of the said provisions, and as time went on restricted them still further. And in 1946 the USSR Supreme Court, referring to the 1938 Judiciary Act, which made no mention of social defence measures, indicated to courts that criminal punishment could be inflicted only where there was a concrete crime.

As regards analogy, the disappearance of the conditions giving rise to it left no place for it in practice, and in those cases where courts applied it they often did so although there was no need for it, and the verdicts in those cases were later set aside by a higher court.

And yet, despite all this, right up to the enactment of the new fundamentals, the provision still figured in the law, making it possible to apply repression to persons who did not commit a socially dangerous act, or who committed a socially dangerous act not expressly envisaged by the criminal law.

This period in the history of Soviet criminal legislation is now over, and it is no accident that clause 2 of Article 3 states that "criminal punishment may be inflicted only by sentence of a court". This rule, which also consolidates the principle which came into practice following the abolition of the Special Tribunal in 1953, does not mean merely that criminal punishment may not be meted out by any agency except a court, in other words only in strict observance of the guarantees established by the law on procedure.

If that were all that was involved, it would have been sufficient to insert a proper provision in the new Principles of Criminal Procedure, where, incidentally, it figures in Article 7. The fact that it is also found in the *criminal* code, and, moreover, in the same article in which the "grounds of criminal liability" are defined, is of special significance. This imparts to it something like an extra guarantee that henceforth criminal punishment may not be meted out in practice or as a matter of principle, except where a socially dangerous act envisaged by criminal law has been committed — in other words where a crime has been committed and the state's reaction thereto can be nothing less than punishment, that is a measure of compulsion by the state that is not merely penal retribution for the crime committed but is also aimed at reforming and re-educating the convict.

This document defines the principles and fixes the general provisions of the criminal law of the USSR and the Union Republics in conformity with Article 2 of the fundamentals. It is on the basis of these principles and theses that intensive work is now going on in preparing and discussing the draft criminal codes of the republics. Inter-republican conferences were held in April and May in Tashkent, Tbilisi, Kiev and Riga to discuss the drafts, and the conferences attracted the attention of the legal community throughout the country. It is not only that the criminal codes of the republics make up the greater part of Soviet criminal law; extremely important too is another aspect of the matter, for it is republican legislation that will mitigate the punishment for a whole series of acts by lowering the term of deprivation of liberty, and by increasing the proportion of penalties not involving deprivation of liberty. Such penalties will be widely stipulated in the codes as alternatives, and in a number of cases in place of the others. There is every reason to believe also that the new codes will quite widely embody a new system, what may be called a pre-judicial public or administrative phase, *a system which is already proving successful in practice*. What I mean is the system under which measures designed to exert influence by the community or administrative action will be applied in the case of a good many criminal acts, with criminal prosecution instituted only after a repetition of the act.

Surveys and Reviews

HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN BALLET

THE Soviet book *The Russian Ballet Theatre from its Origin to the Middle of the 19th Century** is the first attempt to trace scientifically the fundamental phases in the development of Russian ballet and to characterise its national and historical peculiarities. It is a comprehensive study, though it does not exhaust all extant materials on the subject. It would be beyond the scope of this review to give a detailed account of the facts and discussions contained in the book, and I can give only a short résumé of the main periods in the history of Russian ballet.

The deep roots of dancing in Russia are traced to ancient times when it was an inseparable part of pagan rites. There are among antique works of Slavonic art, found in Kievan Russia, some dancing figures cast in silver which belong to the sixth century. The earliest documents about *skomorokhi* — professional dancers, musicians and actors — belong to the eleventh century. Some frescoes in St. Sophia Cathedral in Kiev show dancing *skomorokhi*. *Skomorokhi* travelled all over Russia, and sometimes crossed the frontier and went as far as Italy. Some of them settled on the estates of princes and boyars. From the middle of the sixteenth century they became entertainers at the court of the Moscow czars, where they served in the *poteshnaya palata* (amusement chamber) — a forerunner of the future court theatre.

No domestic or social festivals of the Russian peasants took place without dancing, solo and *khороводи* (community dancing).

The first ballet in the Russian theatre was produced in 1673 at the command of Czar Alexei Mikhailovich. It was called *The Ballet of Orpheus and Eurydice* and was presented in a pompous, fairy manner. The so-called assemblies introduced by Peter the Great, where all invited guests had to dance western ballroom dances, broadened the view of the art of dancing and stimulated demand for a ballet theatre. In the eighteenth century the technique of ballroom and ballet dancing was on approximately the same level. In 1734 Jean Landé was appointed a dancing teacher at the Cadets School. Noting the great ability of Russians for dancing, he thought of organising a special ballet school. Empress Anna Ioannovna took an interest in his project and founded a state school in 1738. Soon Landé's pupils became so successful that they were dancing in the Italian Opera in St. Petersburg together with Italian dancers under the leadership of ballet master Fusano. Landé used to put on "serious" ballets in which the dances were akin to ballroom style — slow, *terre-à-terre*, with soft, flowing movements. One such ballet was presented in Moscow in 1742 on the occasion of the coronation of Elizaveta Petrovna. Later the same year Fusano returned to Russia with a small company of Italian dancers. He produced comic and character ballets in which there were no symmetrical formations, and the choreography was a form of theatrical virtuosity of Italian folk dancing, very lively, with jumps, *pirouettes*, acrobatic splits, etc.

In spite of their different style, comic and serious ballets were not incompatible and were sometimes combined in the same spectacle. A Russian

* Russkii Baletnyi Teatr ot Vozniknoveniya do Sere diny XIX veka. V. Krasovskaya. "Iskusstvo", 309 pp., 15/-. (Available from Collet's Holdings.)

ballerina of those days was Aksinia Sergeeva, who was by no means inferior to her Italian colleagues.

In the first half of the eighteenth century Russian ballet became a permanent organisation with its own company; and in 1756 a public theatre was established in St. Petersburg. Many foreign ballet masters, finding no scope in their own countries, realised their creative conceptions in Russia. They were inspired by Noverre's principles. In the second half of the eighteenth century the themes of most ballets were mythological, and Russian folklore was rarely used, but Russian music and dancing found their way into comic operas, whose librettos were based on national subjects.

A ballet school was opened in Moscow in 1773, thirty-five years after the formation of the St. Petersburg school. It was attached to the House of Foundlings, the inmates of which were trained as professional dancers and studied also music and singing. In 1784 this school was put under the auspices of the Petrovsky Theatre, owned by an Englishman, Maddox; and after this theatre was destroyed by fire in 1806 Moscow theatres and the ballet school were taken over by the state and called "Imperial". The democratic tendencies of the Moscow ballet differed from the aristocratic tastes of the St. Petersburg court theatre. Space forbids listing the numerous ballets given in both capitals.

Parallel to the professional ballet in the capitals, serf ballet theatres were developing on the estates of Russian landowners. Rich noblemen possessed thousands of peasants, and their estates were miniature monarchies. Some of their ballet theatres were organised on the same lavish scale and achieved the same degree of perfection as the state ones. Their serfs were trained in the art of dancing from childhood. Musicians and designers of *décor* were also recruited from among talented peasants. But though their education was equal to that of the children of nobility, the life of serf dancers was not happy. They could be bought and sold like cattle, and suffered all the other injustices of their social status. With the impoverishment of serf owners at the beginning of the nineteenth century, dancers were sold to private impresarios and state theatres. In 1829 the Moscow Bolshoi Theatre bought twenty-one female dancers. Serf ballet left a deep imprint on Russian ballet, particularly as regards its intense national colour.

At the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth, the Russian choreographers Valberkh and Glushkovsky, dissatisfied with imitations of western ballets, searched for new forms and national themes. Russian composers of those days were Titov, Davidov and Aliabiev, while among the foreign ones employed in Russia were the Italians Cavo and Antonolini and the German composer Scholtz. The curriculum of the St. Petersburg theatre school included dancing, music, singing, drama and painting, all of which were compulsory subjects. Dancing teachers were Angiolini and Canziani, both followers of Noverre. They paid attention to pantomime, and dancing contained elements of Italian virtuosity, including the acrobatic art of *Commedia dell'Arte*. At the same time, Charles Le Picq propagated the French manner of dancing, composing slow *adagios* and *allegros* which already contained *entrechats* and *pirouettes*. Valberkh, who had an extensive general education, produced thirty-six ballets on themes from mythology, history, literature and life. He became a dancing teacher in the St. Petersburg school in 1794 and worked out a synthesis of Russian interpretative style with dramatic pantomime, Italian virtuosity and elements of the French school. He prepared the Russian school for the high level of activity which began with the arrival of Charles Didelot in St. Petersburg in 1801. At that time male dancing was technically more highly developed than female. After Didelot's arrival Valberkh went to Paris to see French ballet. Giving their

due to French ballet masters, he appreciated Didelot most of all. On March 14, 1802, he made a note in his Paris diary: "One must not expect an historically correct ballet here — a very light subject and much spinning." On the other hand, the poetry and drama of Didelot's ballets made Valberkh recognise the superiority of his French rival, whose assistant he later became.

Nevertheless Valberkh's own achievements were immense. Continuing Noverre's reforms, he created expressive *ballet d'action*. He was not satisfied with exclusive presentation of ancient heroes. In his ballets were portrayed features from real life and ordinary people acted. In 1799 he put on *The New Werther*, and in 1809 *Romeo and Juliet*. Valberkh's French contemporary, Auguste Poireau, or simply Auguste, as he was called, began his career in St. Petersburg in 1798 as *premier demi-caractère danseur*, and later became Valberkh's and Didelot's assistant. He was a great exponent of Russian character dances and produced several ballets on Russian themes. After retirement in 1826, Auguste at times continued his activity. Thus in 1839 he taught Maria Taglioni a Russian dance, which she performed with him on the St. Petersburg stage. His pupil Kolosova was an eminent ballerina who, in the words of Didelot and Glushkovsky, "shone like a diamond". Her movements and facial expression were as eloquent as speech. Of course, the naturalness of her acting, like that of other artists in those days, was conventional and far removed from realistic simplicity as we know it now. It retained the artificial loftiness and picturesqueness of the classical school with its set plasticity. It was only her great talent that prevented conventional acting from obscuring the feelings of the characters she portrayed.

From 1801 to 1811 was the first period of Didelot's activity as a dancer, teacher and choreographer in St. Petersburg, where he returned in 1816. Russia offered great scope to his creative talent. He produced many ballets which surpassed the anacreontic ballets of the eighteenth century. Instead of rococo mannerisms and heavy classical conventions, he created true classical clarity of form and content. Furthermore, in contrast to the behaviour of ancient gods and goddesses, his Zephyr and Flora, *Amour et Psyché*, played a drama of human passion and attracted the audience by the poetical portrayal of earthly experiences. He introduced light costumes, flights on wire, and scenery that was conditioned by artistic unity of the spectacle whose basis was choreographic action, including pantomime and expressive dancing. Technique was well developed in his time. Male technique reached special virtuosity—high jumps, *entrechats*, *pirouettes*, *tours en l'air*. Female dancing was less complicated. It was devoid of great flights and was mostly *terre-à-terre*. The technique of *pirouettes* was undeveloped because of undeveloped dance on *pointes*. Resting on high *demi-pointes* a ballerina stayed on the point of stretched toes only occasionally and for an instant. Shoes whose soles ended at the level of the toes and not before did not give the necessary support for this. Equally limited was support in a duet dance. A ballerina usually leaned on her partner's hands. He seldom lifted her to the level of his chest, and never threw her up into the air. Great attention was paid to the arms of a ballerina.

Didelot disapproved of virtuosity for its own sake. He insisted on expressiveness. The process of composing music was dictated by Didelot. This method curtailed the composer's initiative. Sometimes Didelot borrowed fragments from operas by Mozart, Cherubini and Gretri. Antonolini and Cavo were his principal collaborators. As a teacher, Didelot was very severe with his pupils, who often sustained bruises inflicted by his stick. Nevertheless, many were infected by his enthusiasm and liked him. His methods were soon crowned with success.

The female dancer now occupied a leading position. The most brilliant

ballerinas were Ikonina, Novitskaya and Danilova. The latter was very beautiful and ethereal. Among male dancers, Louis Dupont was technically outstanding. He had marvellous elevation but was a bad actor.

Until the opening of the Bolshoi Theatre in 1825 the Moscow ballet was giving performances in the Arbat Theatre, opened in 1808 after the destruction of the Petrovsky Theatre. A considerable role in the formation of Moscow ballet was played by the Russian dancer and ballet master Ablets. He put on a series of comic, character and anacreontic ballets. In 1811 Didelot's gifted pupil Glushkovsky was appointed a ballet master in Moscow, but his activity was interrupted by the French invasion in 1812, during which the theatre and school were evacuated to the Volga. Patriotic feeling was reflected in the repertoire of the theatres, and national features defined the progress of choreographic art. Particularly popular was the ballet *Semik* — a pagan spring festival of the ancient Slavs — produced by Ablets to music by Davidov. It contained colourful dances performed by brilliant dancers, among whom shone Ivanova, Novikova and Lobanov. This ballet remained in the repertoire of the Bolshoi Theatre until 1862.

In St. Petersburg character dances were more stylised than in Moscow. Under the aristocratic influence genuine folk dances became *boyar*, and sometimes there appeared pseudo-national compositions. Between 1810 and 1814 some ballets in both capitals were genuinely national, while others were chauvinistic, although in Moscow choreographers could more easily avoid the tendentious pressure of the St. Petersburg official reactionary ideology.

Ablets and Glushkovsky produced many ballets — *divertissements* on national themes, depicting customs and morals. With the advent of the reign of Nicolas I with its military patriotism and reaction, folklore features disappeared from ballet *divertissements* and their choreography became devoid of content.

During the war of 1812 the St. Petersburg ballet continued its performances. The following twenty-five years in the history of Russian ballet are known as the Pushkin period. After Didelot's return to St. Petersburg in 1816 his activity embraced various genres of choreographic art — mythological, fairy, comic and dramatic ballets. *The Prisoner of the Caucasus*, based on Pushkin's poem, to the music of Cavos, was a crowning success of Didelot's creative career. The role of the Cherkess girl was danced by Istomina, whose name has been made immortal by Pushkin in *Eugene Onegin*, where in beautiful poetical phrases are reproduced her dance movements: *rond de jambe, renversé, battement battu* and *jeté*:

“ And suddenly a leap: behold she flies
Like down puffed by Æolian lips.”

Other brilliant ballerinas of the epoch were Likhutina, of whom Pushkin sang in one of his draft stanzas in *Eugene Onegin*, and Teleshova, whose dancing inspired Griboedov to write a lyrical poem and whose portrait was painted by Bryullov and Kiprensky.

In Moscow during the Pushkin period, ballet also began a new page in its history under the leadership of Glushkovsky, who put on two ballets based on Pushkin's poems: *Ruslan and Ludmilla* to music by Scholtz in 1821, and *The Black Shawl* in 1831. Thus Didelot and his pupil began the tradition of choreographic incarnation of characters from Russian literature.

At that time there was in Moscow the Italian ballet master Bernadelli, who, among other ballets, produced *Mechanical Figures*, a comical parody on some contemporary ballets, and *Richard the Lion-hearted*, after Walter Scott's novel. He also put on his own version of *La Fille Mal Gardée*.

In January 1825 the Bolshoi Theatre was opened with *The Triumph of the*

Muses, in which the role of Terpsichore was danced by Gullegne-Sort, who was a member of the Bolshoi Company. The second ballet presented that night was *Cendrillon*.

After 1832 ballet entered a period of decline. This was due not only to Didelot's retirement and the lack of talent of his two French successors Blache and Titus, who were mere craftsmen, but also to the growing interference of reactionary officials in the production of ballets, for whom they were not art but merely light and pompous entertainment. Thus, in *The Revolt in the Seraglio* female dancers not only bathed in a fountain, but were ordered by Nicholas I to perform military manœuvres on the stage. High circles were more interested in opera, and therefore it was more fortunate, in a sense, than ballet. There were at that time operas by Glinka and Dargomyzhsky. In Glinka's operas, for the first time in Russian ballet music, dances were composed in symphonic manner. Unfortunately, however, Titus failed to express the character and national colour of Polish dances in *Ivan Susanin* (named by Nicholas I *A Life for the Czar*). Neither did he succeed in arranging classical and character dances for *Ruslan and Ludmilla*. Only years later did Glinka's music receive true artistic choreographic incarnation.

Gogol, writing about the necessity of reforms in ballet, concluded prophetically: "The dance will then have more sense, and this light, airy, flame-like language will become more imaginative and unrestrained." Glinka and Gogol were ahead of their time.

The art of Filippo and Maria Taglioni, who lived and worked in Russia for five years, from 1837 to 1842, opened new creative horizons when the craftsmanship of Titus was threatening the fate of the St. Petersburg ballet.

Whereas Didelot's romantic images grew on the soil of real life and were distinguished by classical clarity and optimism, Taglioni's romanticism was a product of idealistic imagination. They both, however, were great achievements of the nineteenth century. In Didelot's ballets, pantomime was the chief means of expression, whereas in Taglioni's choreography it was the aerial dance of his daughter Maria, and the *corps de ballet*. The latter was no longer an ornamental background but an organic part of the acting ensemble. The creations of Maria and Filippo Taglioni influenced the style of *Giselle*, whose *première* in St. Petersburg was presented in 1842, the year following its *première* in Paris, with Andreyanova in the title role. Lucile Grahn, who appeared in this role in 1843 as a guest artist, was, according to critics, not as successful as Andreyanova. Her interpretation was mechanical. Fanny Elssler, who came to Russia in 1848–51, was not better as *Giselle*, but in *La Fille Mal Gardée* she revealed her great talent glittering with *joie de vivre*, fire and fine emotional characterisation. Both Maria Taglioni and Fanny Elssler were dancers of the romantic style, but otherwise were poles apart. Taglioni was air, Elssler earthly *élan*.

In 1841 Christian Johanson, a gifted pupil of the Danish ballet master Bournoville, arrived in St. Petersburg, where he remained as a pedagogue to the end of his life in 1903. In the history of Russian ballet, the name of this great dancer stands beside that of Didelot's pupil N. Goltz, who also gave several decades of his life to the Russian theatre, beginning with his *début* in *The Prisoner of the Caucasus* in 1823.

The period of Russian ballet from 1848 to 1859 is connected with the name of Jules Perrot, who made his *début* in his own ballet *Esmeralda*. He was a good actor and had excellent technique, but he distinguished himself chiefly as a choreographer. He used dances to enhance dramatic action, which was his main preoccupation. Apart from its own conventions, choreographic creativeness was then limited by lack of symphonic music. Compositions by Pugni and Minkus were very danceable and "graceful" but were devoid of

The Prophet Unarmed

(Trotsky 1921-1929)

ISAAC DEUTSCHER

In his three-volume life of Trotsky Mr Deutscher is seeking to re-establish the historical truth about one of this century's most controversial political figures. This second volume tells of Trotsky's struggle with Stalin, ending with his banishment from Russia. "... it is here that Trotsky is restored to his real stature set against his time . . . an indispensable book for anyone who wants to understand Russia of yesterday, today and tomorrow."
—*The Economist*.

Illustrated 38s. net

THE WORLD'S CLASSICS

A Hero of Our Own Times

MIKHAIL YUREVICH
LERMONTOV

Translated by
EDEN and CEDAR PAUL

With an Introduction by
SIR MAURICE BOWRA

7s. net

A Nest of Gentlefolk and other stories

IVAN S. TURGENEV
*Translated from the Russian
with an Introduction by*
JESSIE COULSON

This volume contains four of Turgenev's most accomplished stories: *A Nest of Gentlefolk*; *A Quiet Backwater*; *First Love*; and *A Lear of the Steppes*.

8s. 6d. net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

depth. Nevertheless, while ballet in western Europe was in the decline, Russian ballet had a great reputation. Théophile Gautier, who visited Russia in 1858, said in *The St. Petersburg Journal*, published in French: "A foreigner who arrived only yesterday hears with rapture strange female names that sound like the singing of unknown birds. . . . Each name signifies beauty, talent or at least youth and hope." And in his book *Voyage en Russie* (Paris 1858), recognising that ballet was far more developed in Russia than in France, he wrote:

"In St. Petersburg it is not easy to get applause for one movement. Russians are great connoisseurs of ballet, and the fire of their opera glasses is dangerous. He who has victoriously borne it can be sure of himself. The ballet school provides remarkable soloists and *corps de ballet*, who have no equals in co-ordination, precision and speed of movements. It is a sheer pleasure to see these lines, so straight, these groups, so clear, which dissolve only at a definite moment in order to reappear in a new formation, to see these little feet obeying a musical measure, all these choreographic battalions which never become confused in their manœuvres. There are no conversation, giggling, tender glances at the audience or orchestra. This is really a world of pantomime where words are absent and action does not go beyond its bounds. This *corps de ballet* is scrupulously selected from the pupils of the school: there are many pretty ones, all are young, beautifully made, and thoroughly know their profession, or, if you prefer, their art."

The first Russian ballerina to appear at the Paris Grand Opéra, and in Brussels, was Smirnova — in Taglioni's role *La Sylphide* in 1844. She had a great success. The following year Andreyanova danced in Hamburg, London, Milan and Paris, where the French critic Jules Janin called her the "Northern Taglioni" and *Le Quotidien* wrote: "Take care, Carlotta Grisi, Planquette and Dumilatre, you are dangerously threatened by the Russian Terpsichore."

In Moscow in the middle of the nineteenth century the leading ballerinas were T. Karpakova and Sankovskaya. The latter danced *La Sylphide* at its *première* on September 6, 1837, the same night as Taglioni appeared in this role in St. Petersburg. Whereas Taglioni's *Sylphide* perished from contact with the world of human beings, Sankovskaya's was striving to get into that world. In general, ballet in Moscow displayed a more realistic tendency than in St. Petersburg. Moscow dancers worked in association with the actors of the Imperial Dramatic Theatre. Among the Moscow male soloists were Gerino, Bogdanov, Nikitin, Monakhin and Peshkov. Carlo Blasis, whose service in Moscow coincided with that of Peshkov, had a very high opinion of his Russian colleague.

The theme of tragic conflict between fantasy and reality as revealed by the art of the Taglionis required new forms of choreographic expression, a new style of classical dance, a new system of inspired, ethereal, poetical imagery. The action was now built according to laws of symphonic development. The central figure of the spectacle became the ballerina. Much was done by Glinka for the development of Russian romantic choreography. He formulated the principles of symphonic construction of choreographic action, and the principles of the dance as an image.

The middle of the nineteenth century was for Russian ballet the beginning of new and glorious epochs — those of Tchaikovsky and Glazunov, Petipa and Lev Ivanov, Gorsky and Fokine.

V.K.

RUSSIAN CLASSICS AND THE TRANSLATORS

Tatiana Shebunina

AMONG the recent publications which seem to point to a revival of interest in Russian classics we have now at least two new translations of Turgenev's popular *A House of Gentlefolk*, as well as a reprint of Constance Garnett's earlier one.

The latest version is by Jessie Coulson.* Together with three other of Turgenev's best-known long stories (*A Quiet Backwater*, *A Lear of the Steppes* and *First Love*) it has appeared as volume 570 in the World Classics series. The novel is too well known to need any introduction or commentary (Constance Garnett's translation is in its twelfth edition), but what may be useful, in view of the still widely varying quality of translations from the Russian, is to make a technical study of this new interpretation and see how it compares with the other two.

Jessie Coulson's translation reads very well; her style is fluent and clear, her regrouping of sentences, called for by the difference in structure of the two languages, is careful and done with a light touch. The occasional use of a Russian term for some specifically Russian object (e.g. *tarantas*—a spring-less carriage) is justified and unobtrusive, except for the unnecessary substitution here and there of *moujik* for "peasant", which strikes a jarring note. Less happy is the literal rendering of some idiomatic expressions where an English equivalent would have been more telling: thus the irate Lear of the steppes, were he expressing himself in English, would have undoubtedly said something like "I'd squash you like a black-beetle", rather than "If I hit you, there'll be nothing but a damp mark left on the ground where you were". The transliteration in the useful list of characters is good and up to date, and so are, with some exceptions, the directions for their accentuation (corrections needed: Mikhalévich, Agéy, Tsénteler). One might question, however, the system of anglicising some of the Christian names to the exclusion of others (Pyotr becomes Peter, but Pavel does not become Paul). Not only does it lack consistency, but it also produces an oddly hybrid effect when, as is generally the case, the English form of the name is coupled with a patronymic. And why both Maria and Marya?

But form is, needless to insist, only one of the two equally important qualities of a translation. Accuracy is the other. And as it is precisely in the matter of accuracy that Constance Garnett's translations, made over half a century ago, are now found wanting by modern standards, it is particularly interesting to see, taking *A House of Gentlefolk* as a sample, how the new translation compares with the old, and whether it marks sufficient progress to supersede it. On the whole Jessie Coulson's version is very faithful and is free from the obnoxious "little fathers" and such-like. And yet, surprisingly enough, while avoiding most (though not all) of Constance Garnett's errors, J.C. wipes out this advantage by making an equal, if not a greater, number of her own; some, moreover, more important than any of C.G.'s, whose mistakes are mainly in single words. We find, for instance, at the very outset, the startling "good-mornings" exchanged against the background of a poetically described early evening. The age of Panshin, already well launched on a successful career, is given as an improbable twenty-two instead of the actual twenty-seven, and the disreputable Panshin père is said to have been held for

* *A Nest of Gentlefolk and Other Stories*, I. Turgenev; translated by Jessie Coulson (O.U.P., 1959, 461 pp., 8/6).

“a genuine and decent chap” when it was only “a pleasant and hearty fellow”. Most important of all is the misinterpretation of a whole passage describing Lavretsky’s thoughts and emotions in church. J.C.’s version runs (the italics are mine): “That, he *thought now, was* my guardian angel accepting me . . .” and farther on: “He was deeply moved and sought peace *from* another’s soul, and forgiveness *from* his own.” What Turgenev says is: “That, he *used to think then, is* the guardian angel receiving me . . .” and “he prayed *for* another soul, peace; *for* his own, forgiveness.” In every one of these instances Constance Garnett gives the right interpretation. On quite a few minor points, too, her version is the better one, as for instance “sectaries” for “old believers”, as against Jessie Coulson’s “schismatics”.

The other recent translation of the novel is by Richard Hare, published in 1947 under the title *A Nobleman’s Nest*. Like J.C.’s, it is in many ways quite good, but as far as accuracy is concerned it seems merely to take a middle course between the other two. Richard Hare rightly follows C.G. with “road” where J.C. has mistakenly “street”. Like J.C., he has the meaningless “stretched his riding-crop across [J.C. “along”] the horse’s neck” where C.G. gives the correct “gave it a cut with the whip across the neck”. Then again he is right with C.G. with “slender” candlesticks (J.C. “silver”). In a few cases he alone of the three is right (e.g., “crooked porch”; C.G. “a winding flight of steps”; J.C. “a curving flight of steps”), or alone wrong (e.g., in making the page a Cossack).

Trifling as some of these mistakes or near misses may seem, they often modify the effect of a whole sentence. Thus the attentive reader might wonder at a visitor appearing in a lady’s drawing room on a summer evening clad in an overcoat (C.G. and J.C. correctly “frock-coat”), or at a scrawny peasant being able to cover thirty-five miles in one day (C.G. “lean”, R.H. better “wiry”). The crooked (better “sagging”) porch is an integral feature of the ramshackle appearance of Lavretsky’s house. A little finger “stuck stiffly out” is not the proper description of Madame Kalitin’s somewhat coy gesture (C.G. and R.H. “gracefully separated from the others”). And so on.

The only possible conclusion seems to be that we have not come far since Constance Garnett first translated the novel in 1894!

It is in no carping spirit that this close scrutiny was undertaken. Its purpose was to show that even today translations of Russian classics still suffer from negligence and want of attention to detail, defects from which those of classics of other European languages are now happily exempt. The trouble is that there is not enough constructive criticism of translations as such, for where Russian is concerned the great majority of reviewers are, not unnaturally, handicapped by their ignorance of this difficult language. They can judge the translator’s work only on its outward merits, and cannot be expected to guess that the monk’s gift was not a magic talisman but a holy relic, or that the family had bought their house, not rented it. The English reader has therefore no certainty about the relation of the translation to the original text. To quote an extreme case (concerning not a classic author but one well on the way to becoming one), only a few years ago very favourable reviews in authoritative journals were enjoyed by an American translation of Gorky’s autobiographical trilogy, although on examination this proved to be little more than an enlarged Americanisation of a very bad old English translation, reproducing even such monstrous absurdities as a poor woman’s nine small children transformed into “nine or ten servants”, and her own name Mosevna into “the law of Moses”! One cannot imagine a major literary work in any other language suffering such mutilation today. Fortunately this was indeed an extreme case, but the fact that it could have happened at all goes to show how imperative it is to find some means of ensuring a general up-to-date

standard for all translations from the Russian, especially if Russian classics are to be tackled afresh.

It has often been regretfully asked why Constance Garnett did not seek the advice of some Russian friend who would have easily weeded out the errors which mar her otherwise admirable work. Here, perhaps, is the remedy we seek. If translators would put their pride in their pockets and enlist the help of a Russian consultant, the latter would steer them clear of the pitfalls of the dictionaries (since even the latest ones are far from comprehensive) and explain to them the unorthodox constructions, the allusions and sayings, especially in their abbreviated, less recognisable form, which still baffle many a life-long student of the language. In support of this method one can mention the good results obtained by Russian translators into English aided by English colleagues. Literary critics in their turn could do much to help establish and maintain the desired standard by finding out more about the technical quality of a translation before delivering their verdicts. They would thus provide the readers with reliable guides and ensure due respect in the treatment of Russian authors.

RECENT SCR INFORMATION BULLETINS

Education

Reorganisation of Secondary Education ; Regulations for Eight-year School.
Vol. 6. No. 1/2. 3/- (3/4 post free).

Law

The Legal Profession in the USSR ; Principles of Soviet Criminal Law.
Vol. 6. No. 1/2. 3/- (3/4 post free).

Medicine

The Seven-year Plan and the Health Service.
Vol. 6. No. 2. 1/6 (1/10 post free).

Psychology

Work with Unsuccessful Pupils.
Vol. 6. No. 3. 1/6 (1/10 post free).

Music

Recordings of Soviet Artists (available in Great Britain).
No. 2, 1959. 3/- (3/4 post free).

Science

Space Research with Rockets and Satellites ; Training Young Scientists.
Vol. 6. No. 2/3. 3/- (3/4 post free).

Theatre

New Plays in the Soviet Theatre.
No. 1, 1959. 3/- (3/4 post free).

All available from SCR, 14 Kensington Square, London, W.8.

Book Reviews

ATOMS . . .

The Atomic Nucleus. M. Korsunsky; trs. by G. Yankovsky. (FLPH, 412 pp., 65 figs., 45 pl., 8/-). Available from Collet's Holdings.)

IN an era of exciting developments in many branches of science and its application, none has assumed greater importance in its political and economic implications than the growth of our knowledge and understanding of the atomic nucleus. An elementary knowledge of the significant basic facts of nuclear physics has become essential for the ordinary citizen who wishes to take an intelligent interest in public affairs. The application of these basic facts to the development of nuclear weapons has brought far-reaching and disturbing changes in military strategy and in international politics. Their application to peaceful purposes will have an increasingly important impact on the economics of very many countries. And clearly the extent of these exciting applications can still only be perceived in barest outline. With the successful solution of the problem of the control of thermonuclear reactions there will undoubtedly be opened up an immeasurably greater field of application.

Many books have now appeared in English in which the basic facts of nuclear physics have been described for the non-specialist reader, and some have been very successful. One is aware of the high importance attached to the question of the popularisation of science in the Soviet Union, and it is of particular interest, therefore, to see how a branch of science that has assumed such far-reaching importance is presented to Soviet readers.

One must say at the outset that the writer has succeeded admirably in maintaining the interest of the reader. He uses simple terms which should be intelligible to the reader without specialised knowledge, but at the same time his treatment is accurate and he does not vulgarise the subject in the attempt to make it comprehensible.

It is a fascinating story, and the work has not always been carried out under the glare of publicity and with the wealth of resources that has characterised the position since the end of the second world war.

The most significant and crucial developments were carried out by a few dedicated people, driven on by an insatiable curiosity about the structure of matter and with only the faintest glimmerings of the likely applications of their work. By adopting the historical approach the book is able to recapture something of the romance of the development of the subject. It is no ordinary catalogue of facts.

The reason why each particular experiment was carried out at just that particular time is made clear. The problems posed by the interpretation of the results of decisive experiments are discussed, and the numerous false trails that had to be explored on the road to an understanding of the atomic nucleus are clearly set out. The discovery of each new phenomenon is not regarded as an end in itself, but as a step towards a fuller understanding of the problem as a whole; its importance is to be judged largely in terms of the further experiments it suggests.

We are taken from the early discovery by Becquerel of the phenomenon of radioactivity, through the classic researches of Rutherford that led to an understanding of the nature of the radiations emitted. We get a glimpse of the painstaking effort that led Pierre and Marie Curie, with the barest of resources, to process many tons of pitchblende, leading to the separation of a fraction of a gram of the new and highly-important element of radium. We are introduced to the penetrating analysis of Rutherford and his Manchester school, who interpreted the experiments on the scattering of alpha particles by matter, to show quite conclusively that the positive electric charge was concentrated in an extremely small nucleus inside the atom; and we are shown how this led, through the insight of Niels Bohr, to a revolutionary model of the atom that has completely transformed not only the science of physics but that of chemistry as well. We are shown Rutherford as head of the most famous physics laboratory in the world, the Cavendish Laboratory at Cambridge, ceaselessly probing the structure of the nucleus, using fast atomic missiles to disintegrate a wide range of nuclei; and the consummation of all this work in the experiments of Rutherford's students, Cockcroft and Walton, who in 1932 carried out such disintegrations with artificially accelerated particles, thus paving the way for the development of the subject of nuclear physics as we know it today.

The year 1932 saw the beginning of the golden era of nuclear physics. In rapid succession we saw Chadwick's discovery of the neutron; the discovery of artificial radioactivity by the Joliot-Curies in Paris, and the many basic developments in this field as a result of the work of Fermi in Rome; the discovery of the positron independently by Anderson in America and by Blackett and Occhialini in Cambridge; and the culmination of this era by the discovery of nuclear fission by Hahn and Strassman in Germany, and of the interpretation of its implications by Meitner, Joliot, Bohr and others.

Since the second world war the pace of the development of nuclear and high-energy physics has quickened. This has been the era of the meson, first predicted by Yukawa, and discovered by Powell and his colleagues in Bristol, and of nuclear power and thermo-nuclear reactions. All these developments are discussed in Korsunsky's book, which particularly draws attention to the important role played by Russian physicists—especially in the later stage of the story—leading up to the construction, by Veksler and his colleagues in Dubna, of the largest high-energy particle accelerator in the world, capable of producing particles of energy ten thousand million electron volts.

One could not, of course, expect a book of this size to give a complete popular record of all aspects of the subject. It would have been interesting to see, for instance, the way in which the author presented the basic ideas of quantum mechanics to the non-specialist reader, particularly in their application to the understanding of the phenomenon of the decay of the alpha particle, as developed by Gamow. And it is characteristic of the feverish rate at which the subject is developing that the section on heavy mesons and hyperons is already out of date.

However, these are minor, and to some extent unavoidable, defects. The simplicity of the explanations, the way in which the continuity of the development of our knowledge of the subject is always kept before the reader, the numerous diagrams and plates, all contribute to the high quality of the work, which can be thoroughly recommended to schoolboy and adult alike.

E. H. S. BURHOP.

... AND METEORS

Meteors. V. Fedynsky. (FLPH, 1959, 126 pp.)

METEORS, commonly known as shooting-stars, are the junior members of our solar system. We see them only when they rush into the earth's atmosphere from outer space, and glow brilliantly for a second or two before being destroyed. Yet they are both interesting and significant, and in this book V. Fedynsky provides a clear and concise introduction to meteor astronomy.

Starting with a brief historical survey, Fedynsky deals with modern methods of studying meteors; meteors themselves, with some comments on their effects upon future interplanetary travel; meteorites, the solid pieces of material which sometimes fall to the ground and which are therefore available for study in our laboratories; and associated bodies, such as comets and minor planets. The book ends with a discussion of how meteors may have been formed.

This is in every way an excellent book.

It contains a great deal of information, and is easy to read, which is a tribute not only to the author but also to his translator (G. Yankovsky). The illustrations are adequately reproduced and the print is good. As an introduction to the study of meteors it is to be strongly recommended.

PATRICK MOORE.

CHESS IN THE USSR

The Soviet School of Chess. A. Kotov and M. Yudovich. (FLPH, 390 pp., 13/6. Available from Central Books.)

AMONG a good many remarkable points about this book (and even more about its background) a fairly remarkable one is the price; a significant point too when considering the utter impossibility for a commercial publisher here to issue at 13/6 a well-produced and well-indexed book of 390 pages, containing 184 diagrams, twenty-eight illustrations, and some erudite chapters on chess history, chess openings and chess endings, as well as substantial pen-portraits (each with a game or two) of nineteen Soviet grandmasters, twenty-four "ordinary" masters and eight women-masters.

It all goes to prove a fact which for some decades now has needed no further proof—the fact that chess enjoys an enormous amount of encouragement and material support from the authorities in the USSR (and some other countries which, using geographical rather than political nomenclature, might be called eastern).

I am often asked to explain why Soviet grandmasters bestride the chess world with seemingly unchallengeable supremacy. The answer is that Dostoevsky has nothing to do with it; nor indeed have the mysterious depths of the Slavonic soul; nor even the long Russian winter nights. All of this (or some of it) may well have had something to do with creating a traditional interest in the game, going back 100 years to Tchigorin and farther still to Jaenisch and Petrov. The Soviet authorities are very proud of that tradition, which, indeed, provided the title of the book under review. But here I beg to differ, my only grudge against this most informative and entertaining book being its title. I do not think there is a "Soviet school of chess", but there certainly is the simple and undeniable fact that on the very vast territory of the USSR very many persons are very generously encouraged to spend very much time in playing very good chess.

In one of the book's nine large chapters Lenin is quoted as asserting that "preserving a heritage does not at all mean limiting oneself to it". Well, the Soviet players certainly know no limits to their boundless enthusiasm for breaking new ground in opening theory, for studying

end-game technique most meticulously, and for fighting out their middle-game complications with great zest and courage. After all, they have got a score of grandmasters, dozens of masters, hundreds who could claim master rank in almost any other country, thousands of near-master strength and millions of eagerly devoted chess players, their youngsters providing an inexhaustible source of new talent, assiduously coached by their elders and generously supported by the authorities.

All this I had in mind when stating initially that the background of this book had even more remarkable points than the book itself. To understand that background, an English reader would have to think of chess books and magazines sold by scores and hundreds of thousands; and of nothing less than the Albert Hall being big enough to accommodate some really important chess match — indeed, not quite big enough, as there may well be further thousands of would-be spectators crowding the street and certainly some millions waiting for every move to be broadcast or televised.

Inevitably so grand an impetus for the game in one part of the world must have some pleasing repercussions elsewhere; indeed it has, and some political implications too which are none the less pleasing. I saw some evidence of this at the international team tournament held in Munich last year. Teams of thirty-six nations were assembled, and while the Soviet team was, once again, as victorious as was to be expected, many of the other teams, too, did their inspired best. But best of all was the general spirit of comradeship and genuine friendship, living up to the International Chess Federation's proud motto, *Gens una sumus*.

At the concluding banquet — a very jolly affair fraternally uniting teams from as far apart as the USA and the USSR, Puerto Rico and Israel, Finland and the Argentine, and even western and eastern Germany — many a speech pointed to the obvious conclusion that politicians might well take a leaf out of our chess book. That conclusion has lost none of its validity.

ASSIAC.

HOGARTH'S "ANALYSIS"

Analiz Krasoty. V. Khogart; trs. by P. V. Melkova. "Iskusstvo," 336 pp., 24rd., 30k.

THE State Publishing House "Iskusstvo" in Moscow published last year, in the series of "Classical Documents of the Theory of Representational Art", the first Russian translation of William Hogarth's *Analysis of Beauty*. Professor M. P. Alexeev, of Leningrad, provided a lengthy introduction and explanatory notes.

He has also edited the translation. We are not concerned here with the latter,

except perhaps for the remarks that in Hogarth's central aesthetic concept his famous serpentine "line of beauty and grace", *privlekatel'nost* (meaning "attraction"), is the word chosen for "grace", and not *izyashchestvo* or *prelest*, which was used by P. Lavrov, the revolutionary democrat and critic, in the 1860s in his review of the *Analysis*. There are also a number of other questionable translations tending to distort Hogarth's meaning. Organisationally, the reader needing a quick reference is deprived of such an elementary thing as the numbering of pages in the list of contents, which comprises a foreword, introduction and seventeen chapters.

Alexeev used considerably, and with advantage, both the introduction and textological researches made by Prof. Joseph Burke, of Melbourne, and incorporated in his 1955 Oxford edition of the *Analysis*. Alexeev quotes approvingly Burke's view that the *Analysis* has an organic connection with Hogarth's work, which preceded it by a quarter of a century, and that Hogarth's teaching and exercising of "visual mnemonics" accounts for the artist's realistic freshness and immediacy.

He also quotes with approval Dr. F. Antal's excellent article on "Hogarth and his 'Borrowings' from foreign sources. (Incidentally, Antal's posthumous work on Hogarth, we understand, is to appear in London later this year.) He rightly points to Hogarth's satirical polemics with William Kent and his academic traditions as an important genetic factor in the prehistory of the *Analysis*.

In Alexeev's view, Hogarth's theory of the serpentine line had its origin in the rococo style establishing itself, among others, in English architecture and garden design (as exemplified by the Serpentine lake in Hyde Park, constructed in 1727-8) as well as in the *chinoiseries* in buildings and gardens at the time. Such "influences" remain, however, as much guesswork as Alexeev's supposition that Hogarth's evident materialistic outlook was the result of his reading of John Locke. On the other hand, the *Analysis* contains numerous references to Shakespeare, Milton and Swift. The latter's satirical talent had, of course, much in common with Hogarth's. His interest in Shakespeare was probably due to his friendship with Garrick, the finest Shakespearian actor of his times, and with Fielding, who deeply appreciated the playwright.

Alexeev devotes three chapters of his introduction to tracing the repercussions of the *Analysis* during the past 200 years of inæsthetic thought in Germany, France and England. For the latter we should like to add what appears to be the prevalent view of the *Analysis* (not quoted by the Russian). Here we see Austin Dobson, who

in his book *William Hogarth*, published in 1893, calls the *Analysis* "a desultory pamphlet having for its text (or rather pretext) the not very definite axiom attributed . . . to Michelangelo". In 1949 R. B. Beckett in his *Hogarth* played down the impact of the *Analysis* in this country, "but it had a very favourable reception on the Continent, where æsthetic theory was much more in the air". And finally, in the recent Pelican history of *Painting in Britain, 1530 to 1790*, Professor Waterhouse asserts that "the *Analysis* had greater importance in the history of European art theory than in the history of British painting", and alleges that it "does not contribute very much to the direct understanding of Hogarth's style"—this is said in very sharp contrast to what appears to be the prevalent view of recent research students abroad, including, as we have seen earlier, Prof. Alexeev.

The latter's original contribution to Hogarthiana is the last (eleventh) chapter of his long introduction, dealing with the interest shown in Hogarth in Russia, beginning with Radishchev in the eighteenth century, and throughout the nineteenth century in the writings of I. Turgenev, Chernyshevsky, P. Lavrov, A. Herzen, V. Stasov and L. Tolstoy. This excellently produced book, well illustrated and printed in 5,000 copies, will, no doubt, further stimulate intelligent interest in the great English artist in the USSR.

S. OSIAKOVSKI.

FILM MAKER'S SELF-PORTRAIT

Notes of a Film Director. S. Eisenstein; trs. by X. Danko. (Lawrence & Wishart, 1959, 208 pp., 14 pl., 18/-.)

THIS book consists of a collection of Eisenstein's essays and occasional pieces written throughout the course of his entire career, and ranging from brief anecdotes to quite lengthy and closely argued theoretical tracts on his attitude to montage, the relation of film to the other arts, and his views on technical develop-

ments in the cinema, with particular reference to the future of stereoscopy. There are also many items to attract the purely lay reader. In his production notes, Eisenstein recalls the making of *Potemkin* (shot, incidentally, on a cruiser with live mines cluttering up the holds!); the battle on the ice from *Alexander Nevsky*; and the abortive attempt to film Dreiser's *An American Tragedy* in Hollywood. Those who have seen the colour sequences from *Ivan the Terrible*, Part II, will find the article (significantly) entitled "Not Coloured but in Colour" of particular interest. The remainder of the collection includes pieces on Gorki and Chaplin, and several revealing portraits of Eisenstein's close friends and collaborators—Eduard Tissé (his cameraman), Prokofiev (rightly described as the cinema's greatest composer) and Alexander Dovzhenko (the first showing of *Zvenigora* is affectionately recalled). The illustrations include some fascinating photographs of the author, plus a valuable collection of his own drawings and set designs.

Yet, despite their obvious merits, these succinct jottings from a film director's notebook only intermittently reveal their author's inner life and there are few references to the artistic, spiritual and political conflicts in which he became involved. No mention is made of the great Mexican film whose collapse caused him so much personal pain, there is nothing about the second uncompleted film *Bezhin Meadow*, nor are there any comments on the struggle surrounding *Ivan*, that last marvellous testament which was decried and misunderstood by almost everybody at the time. Eisenstein was, without doubt, the most complex, intellectually far-seeking and, at the same time, tormented artist yet to work in the cinema. Although this book gives us little of the torment, its best parts communicate something of its author's fiery, personal vision, which found its fulfilment in the medium he loved.

JOHN GILLET

GEORGIAN POETRY

Amiran-Darejaniani, a cycle of Medieval Georgian tales traditionally ascribed to Mose Khoneli. Trs. by R. A. Stevenson (O.U.P. 42/-.)

MR. STEVENSON claims that his version is the first to be made in any language, and he is much to be congratulated. The cycle of Amiran is an essential part, or rather precondition, of the magnificent outburst of Georgian literature in the twelfth century, which is both interesting in itself and important for the study of medieval culture in general, especially in the Iranian and Byzantine areas. The cycle has further a profound interest in the field of legend and folklore. In it are gathered complex elements, some very old, of

WE BUY

any quantity of books and pamphlets on the Soviet Union, 1917-1958.

THROW NOTHING AWAY!

The Hammersmith Bookshop
Beadon Road, W.6 RIV 6807

Caucasian folk-culture, and these in turn have much wider links and significances.

In 1954, after a giddy mountain drive I came down on the Black Sea in the Colchis region and bathed in the shadow of strange gigantic pines, which I was told were a rare and ancient species now dying out. The headland where they grow was the spot where the Argonauts landed. I should like to believe the tradition. What at least is certain is that there were important contacts of Greek and Georgian culture in that region, of which the tales of the Argo and of Prometheus are outstanding examples. (Amiran is a Promethean figure, by the way, in many Georgian and Ossetian tales.) The full working-out of this rich and fascinating field is yet to be done, together with the examination of the inter-relations of such works as *Amiran* and other folk-epics of the Caucasus like *David of Sasun* collected by Soviet scholars in Armenia. Mr. Stevenson, however, has provided an invaluable aid to the inquiry.

JACK LINDSAY.

BURNS IN RUSSIAN

Robert Burns v Perevodakh S. Marshak. Gosizdkhudlit, 392 pp., 3/9. Available from Collet's Holdings.

Robert Burns. R. R. Kovaleva. Znanie, Moscow, 1959, 32 pp., 0.50r.

Robert Burns. A. Elistratova. Moscow, 1957, 160 pp., 3.40r.

THIS enlarged edition of Samuel Marshak's translation of Burns's poems and the small brochure in the "Znanie" series were published as part of the bi-centenary celebrations in January of this year. The book by Anna Elistratova was published in 1957 following a visit to Scotland by the author in 1955, when along with Boris Polevoy and Samuel Marshak she represented the USSR at the Burns international festival held that year.

This new edition of translations contains sixty-nine more pieces than the 1950 edition. Some of the new translations are of major poems such as *The Twa Dogs*, *Holy Willie's Prayer* and *The Epistle to Davie, a brother poet*. It also includes that well-known poetical joke of Burns *Address to a Haggis*.

"*Tam Glen*", "*Sweet Afton*", "*A Rose-bud by my early walk*" and "*The Gallant Weaver*" are other well-known love songs which now appear for the first time in Russian translation. Twenty of the epigrams are included among the new pieces and the salty, sharp tang of the originals is well preserved.

A very good and informative foreword on the life of the poet by R. R. Kovaleva introduces the new edition of the translations. From the same pen comes the second little book, which is introduced by an original poem by Samuel Marshak on

the cottage in which Burns was born and the house in which he died. The main text of the brochure is more general than the foreword to the translations, but it gives a good all-round picture that helps the reader to understand the eleven poems which are included. More careful editing could have prevented the occasional (though unimportant) factual errors which have crept into it.

Without doubt the best book available in Russian to the serious student of Burns is the small but scholarly work of Anna Elistratova. Dr. Elistratova shows an excellent knowledge of the best first-hand sources available on Burns, and a shrewd estimate of the worth of some of the supposed "authorities" on the poet. In my opinion her book deserves translation into English; it would give many people a completely fresh picture of the bard and demonstrate the way his work is understood in the USSR.

Withal a fine trio of books which help to bind closer the unity and friendship of the peoples of Scotland and the USSR.

TOM CAMPBELL.

WITHOUT FOCUS

Portraits of Russian Personalities between Reform and Revolution. R. Hare. (O.U.P., 360 pp., 42/-.)

IN an earlier book, Mr. Hare had written about a small number of outstanding Russian pioneers of social thought, and had "related them to the significant manner in which they have since been revalued or devalued in the Soviet Union". This method of selection had given historical coherence to the book: from the portraits of individuals had emerged a composite portrait of their age.

His present book lacks a significant focus. Although the personalities represented here "belong to a wider background", the scope has narrowed: the centre of Mr. Hare's gallery is occupied by the reframed portraits of three famous novelists (Tolstoy, Turgenyev, Dostoyevsky); these are flanked by Bakunin, and by the thumbnail sketches and silhouettes of a dozen or so lesser personalities (A. V. Nikitenko, Lavrov, N. F. Fyodorov, V. V. Rozanov, Pobedonostsev, Vitte, Stoly-pin, etc.) who are interesting in themselves (a fuller treatment of some of the minor figures—almost unknown to the general reader—would have been helpful) but whose contribution to the intellectual tradition is not always clearly established.

The random selection of personalities more or less representative of public and intellectual life between 1861 and 1917, in the absence of an integrating historical (as distinct from a purely chronological) framework, necessitates explanations which often do little justice to the situation they are meant to illuminate. Discussing

•
•
• **To be published**
• **during the autumn**
•

• **SHOSTAKOVICH**
•

• *Dmitry Rabinovich*
•

• Written by a prominent Soviet
• musicologist, this critical biography
• of the famous composer
• deals in detail with all his major
• works, together with contemporary
• Russian and world opinion. There
• are chapters on the chamber, vocal
• and choral compositions, and the
• book is well illustrated with
• photographs.

• 200 pp.

12s.

• **LENIN**
• **ON BRITAIN**
•

• This collection of Lenin's writings
• on Britain—on British industrial
• development, British imperialism,
• and the policies and problems of
• the British Labour Movement—was
• first published by Martin Lawrence
• Ltd. in 1934. It has long been out
• of print, and its reissue will be
• widely welcomed.

• 600 pp.

6s.

• **LAWRENCE**
• **and WISHART**
•

the conflict between Stolypin and the Duma, Mr. Hare writes, for instance:

"In the peculiar emotional climate of that time, eloquent left-wing sympathies in politics had become a *sine qua non* for intellectual snobs, and, far from handicapping professional advancement, they tended to promote it, often at the expense of merit. Milyukov (i.e. the Liberal leader) did nothing to discourage agitators who spread personal slanders and gross falsehoods to discredit honest members of the government. Lawyers and intellectuals who flaunted their defiance of the established order would receive the most influential and lucrative appointments, even if they were professional nonentities compared with their conservative rivals, who were indiscriminately abused as "hirelings of the Government". When a Jew was accidentally killed during a riot to free some political prisoners, he was publicly acclaimed a martyr, whereas numerous murders of people appointed to preserve public order were openly applauded by the so-called liberal press" (p. 334).

Mr. Hare claims to have tried "to redress the balance, when eminent nineteenth-century people have served as figureheads for religious or political campaigns or when they have been buried in a grave of stony silence or standardised contempt", but historical asides of the kind just quoted are hardly conducive to a better and more balanced understanding of his chosen personalities or of the society in which they lived.

A. DRESSLER.

A NEGLECTED SUBJECT

Britain's Discovery of Russia, 1553-1815. M. S. Anderson. (Macmillan, 245 pp., 30/-.)

DR. ANDERSON has written a useful book about a hitherto neglected subject. That neglect is understandable. Except in the field of trade, Anglo-Russian relations before the very end of the eighteenth century were tenuous, and even in the field of trade the Tudor attempt to forge direct links with Muscovy, and through Muscovy with the East, was relatively short-lived. The Dutch, whom the Tudor merchants had attempted to circumvent, re-established themselves, and it was not until their economic importance diminished in the eighteenth century that a gradual revival of Anglo-Russian economic relations took place. Consequently, when westernising Russians wanted suitable institutions to study they looked towards Germany and Scandinavia; when they wished to study western ideas they looked to the intellectual headquarters of Europe,

France; and even when they wished to study technological progress they rarely went as far afield as Britain, and then their observations were only cursory. Conversely, neither Englishmen's knowledge nor their understanding of Russian affairs was strikingly great. The Tudor merchants produced valuable pioneer works of information, notably Giles Fletcher's *Of the Russe Commonwealth*, but their almost universal ignorance of the language, and lack of sympathy with a realm so different from their own, imposed considerable limits on their observations. The picture of Russia which they drew remained the foundation of such English views as were current in the following generations.

As Dr. Anderson says: "Until very late in the eighteenth century (i.e. for most of the period with which this book deals) most people were prepared to take the country for granted as a powerful but remote state on the periphery of Europe, not altogether uninteresting, but hardly worthy of the attention paid to France, Italy and the Netherlands." Economically Russia was a traditional complement to Britain, her products being essential for our navy and merchant marine. Politically she was a sort of "natural ally".

British interest in Russia rose sharply from the end of the eighteenth century onwards, though it produced considerably more heat than light: the descriptive and analytical works written by Britons about the country cannot compare in value with those written by the citizens of other states. The chief interest of Dr. Anderson's study of this period lies in his study of the deterioration in Anglo-Russian relations. Russia was increasingly distrusted and hated as a rival power, as the stronghold of European reaction, or as both combined. However, the classic nineteenth-century pattern which Gleason has traced in his *Genesis of Russophobia* did not fully emerge until after the end of the Napoleonic wars.

Dr. Anderson traces all this clearly and with great erudition. He has written a book which all students of Anglo-Russian relations will find of considerable value, and which also illuminates, in passing, many wider problems.

E. J. HOBSBAWM.

A USEFUL TRANSLATION

Peter the Great. Vasilii Klyuchevsky; trs. by Liliana Archibald. (Macmillan, xii and 282 pp., 36/-.)

THIS is a well-produced edition of a new translation of lectures 59-68 of Klyuchevsky's famous course on Russian history given in the eighties of the last century at Moscow University. The translation reads well and has been supplied with useful footnotes which include references to other works available in English

or French. To ease comprehension there are also a short glossary and a clear and helpful map.

There seem to be two main reasons justifying a new translation of this section of Klyuchevsky's masterly work. First, the previous English translation of the complete work was poor and, in places, inaccurate. Second, the importance of Peter's reign in Russian history can hardly be exaggerated. His character as a man has proved a fascination to all who know anything of his activities; and these activities themselves spread over so many fields, and his reforms made such an impact on Russian society, that the assessment and reassessment of his achievements has continued to this day. In the nineteenth-century controversies between Slavophiles and westerners Peter was a central figure, as devil or saviour. For this reason it seems a pity that Mrs. Archibald did not include lecture 69 (dealing with the general situation of Russian society at the time of Peter's death).

Apart from the usefulness of this translation in making an illuminating survey of Petrine history available to the English reader, it gives one some idea of the high level of scholarship achieved by Russian historians in the late nineteenth century. Klyuchevsky was expounding his rounded view of history only a little later than Bishop Stubbs was at his height and well before even Maitland's most important works had appeared.

E. SAWYER.

AID AND TRADE

Soviet Economic Aid: The New Aid and Trade Policy in Under-developed Countries. J. S. Berliner. (O.U.P., 232 pp., 35/-.)

The Soviet Trade Weapon. Susan Strange. (Phoenix House, 2/6.)

IT is an ill wind that blows nobody good. The tension between USA and USSR, which makes life so uncomfortable for us, has been of considerable help to the "underdeveloped countries". Mr. Berliner's book is a plea to his countrymen to improve the quality and the quantity of the aid they offer in order to keep abreast of their rival.

He shows that although, up to date, US aid to the "uncommitted" nations (measured in terms of money grants and loans for civilian purposes) has been many times larger than that coming from the Soviets, the latter was rapidly increasing up till 1957, when it seems, temporarily at least, to have reached a plateau.

The form of Soviet aid has several advantages. Technicians can be seconded to a particular site no longer than is necessary to train up local engineers and managers, while the western expert has his career to think of.

Mr. Berliner argues that a loan at low

interest payable in local produce, which is preferable for obvious reasons to a loan on commercial terms, may also be preferred to an outright gift of cash, since a loan preserves the forms of national self-respect.

The analysis of the actual sums expended is necessarily based to a large extent on guesswork, but Mr. Berliner has made a serious effort to piece the evidence together and his estimates will stand until more data are available.

On the whole he is not very pessimistic (from the US point of view) or optimistic (from the recipients' point of view) about the future expansion of Soviet aid. Meanwhile he pleads for an understanding in the USA of the point of view of the recipients. The comic aspects of the situation do not seem to strike him.

Miss Strange's pamphlet covers the same ground briefly. She also is concerned to plead for a more enlightened policy in the West and is even more candid than Mr. Berliner in showing the advantages of the Soviet method of trading from the point of view of underdeveloped countries.

JOAN ROBINSON.

MIND AND SPEECH

Speech and the Development of the Mental Processes in the Child. A. R. Luria and F. Ia. Yudovich; trs. by J. Simon. (Staples Press, 126 pp., 15/-.)

THE importance of speech in the development of the child's mind has been realised more and more by many teachers in this country, but they are still only a section of the educational world.

In the Soviet Union, influenced by the discoveries of Pavlov, it has received universal attention. In the first part of *Speech and the Development of Mental Processes in the Child*, Professor Luria explains the dynamic nature of the materialist standpoint and contrasts it with the idealist and mechanical approach of many investigators in the western world.

He shows how the demands made on the child by its environment develop its language and therefore its mental processes, which are capable of infinitely increasing throughout life. It is necessary to understand that these processes are physiological if precise and scientific knowledge is to be gained.

It is profoundly interesting to learn of the work being done in the Soviet Union in this field, illustrated in a remarkable study of an experiment with a pair of identical twins.

The second part of the book describes the experiment and illustrates and proves the arguments Professor Luria makes in the first part.

We realise how the domestic, teaching and psychological staffs in the kindergarten where the experiment takes place are

in the habit of working in close harmony. This makes possible the comprehensive nature of the observations and the thoroughness of the records, which are impressive.

The translation is excellent; having no knowledge of Russian, I was yet able to follow the limitations and development of the twins' language at every stage.

It is an interesting book written in a direct style and as simply as the subject allows. I hope it is widely read, as it so deeply enriches our attitude to education.

EVE DRON.

MOSCOW STUDENTS

Students of Moscow University. M. Mikryukov (FLPH, Moscow, 129 pp. Distributed by Central Books Ltd. and Collet's Holdings Ltd., 4/-.)

AFTER decades of ignoring the possibilities of Soviet education, many westerners are now viewing its progress with distinct feelings of uneasiness. This book can explain to the aggrieved competitors (as well as the unworried interested) the details of the system, as shown at Moscow University. Probably because it does not even occur to the author, he does not deal with that aspect of Soviet education which is at the root of its success: the value of eggheadedness that is everywhere in Soviet society. But leaving that out, this is how it is done.

Twenty-two thousand students, of seventy nationalities, are enrolled in the university's twelve faculties. Everyone has seen photographs of the famous new "Palace of Learning" on Moscow's Lenin Hills; there the six natural science faculties are located. Students of the humanities attend lectures in the 150-year-old building in the centre of the city.

None of these students walks in or walks out with ease: the entrance qualifications and level of work required are terrifyingly high. Lectures are compulsory, and annual papers are required of each student. Studies last for five years, and the academic years is nearly ten months long.

These standards go far in explaining the success of the system; much more important is the attempt to link theory with practice. Throughout the year a student does a lot more than sit in a library cramming in ancient wisdom; a young journalist has daily newspaper assignments, a student scientist is expected to be doing independent and original research by his fourth year. And all of them must spend a part of each summer doing practical work in factories and farms, fields and cities — the places where their studies become a reality. At the end of five years they know not just what but *why* they have learned; and they have not just learned, they have already *done*.

While all this is being achieved, the

ordinary business of living is made as pleasant as possible. All students receive stipends (twenty-five per cent higher for those getting top marks), and each has an inexpensive room, use of communal kitchen or cafeteria, and access to shops in the university building itself. There are plenty of ways of finding fun after the grind.

The book is full of interesting but not always relevant detail, and sketches of individuals that often make it come alive. But the prose style varies from coy to square ("As everywhere, dear reader, the lads of our university fall in love with the girls and now and again the girls with the lads"), unfortunately tending to indicate that somebody in Moscow University's faculty of journalism (of which the author is apparently a product) may have slipped up somewhere.

SALLY BELFRAGE.

SOVIET SCHOOLS

A Glimpse into a Boarding School. (FLPH, Moscow. Distributed by Central Books Ltd., 2/-.)

A USEFUL "visual aid" for those interested in the new boarding schools has recently arrived from the FLPH, Moscow. It is a pictorial record, with English text, of the daily activities of the boys and girls at Moscow boarding school No. 7. Schools such as this were first opened in 1956/7 and are being extended to cater for 1,000,000 children in the next few years. As distinct from the previously existing boarding schools or hostels in areas where difficult communications made them necessary, these schools are being opened all over the country, many in Moscow and Leningrad, for children with difficult home conditions; and applications for admission far exceed the number of places. According to N. V. Naumov, of the RSFSR Ministry of Education (in *Pervye itogi*, Uchpedgiz 1957), of the first 20,000 children admitted to the first 105 schools of the Russian Federation 1,860 were orphans, 7,112 were fatherless, 1,880 were children of disabled servicemen or workers, 4,817 were from low-income families with a large number of children and 232 were "problem" children from well-to-do families. These schools have the advantages of smaller classes (maximum thirty) and of not being shared with another shift. The pupils, who often live quite near, live and work at school all the week and go home for Sundays and holidays. The heads have been given great freedom to organise and experiment with school routine. My own visit to school No. 13 in Moscow in 1957 (during the summer holiday unfortunately) confirms that these schools are excellently equipped and staffed by efficient enthusiasts. As one looks at the pictures of these healthy youngsters working (in classroom or kit-

chen), dancing, eating, reading and making music, one cannot help thinking that if these are the less fortunate and deprived they are pretty cheerful specimens of their generation.

Readers of Russian can find further useful data in the work quoted — *Pervye itogi* — in the SCR Library. It is a symposium of the achievements and difficulties of the first year of boarding schools.

C. E. SIMMONDS.

TEXTBOOK FOR FOREIGNERS

Uchebnik Russkogo Yazyka dlya Nerusskikh — Fonetika, Morfologiya i Osnovy Sintaksisa : Part I. N. G. Khromets, A. P. Veisman, P. M. Onyshchuk. (Moscow, 1959, 606 pp., 11r. 90k.)

THIS volume of 485 pages is divided into fifty-seven lessons for students of no particular nationality. As it is written entirely in Russian, it is essentially a textbook for the teacher, and useless for independent study by those unacquainted with the language. Putting aside this limitation, however, it has very considerable advantages for teaching Russian in schools.

Phonetics are introduced in a well-balanced and gradual way alongside morphology and syntax, and are founded on a practical approach. Great emphasis is placed upon pronunciation, exercises being provided throughout the course, in a more comprehensive fashion than in any other textbook of which I am aware. Very extensive material for reading, paraphrasing and précis writing is included, likewise extensive sections of questions and answers.

The treatment of the verb in this volume is original. It is not dismembered, as is often the case in other grammars, but is presented to the student in its entity. The two aspects are at once explained, the student being presented straight away with the fullness of the language, thereby avoiding the one-sided and stilted impression which is often given to him by conventional methods of teaching, which at first reveal to him only one aspect of the verb. Considerable advantage is gained when the feel of the full roundedness of the language is imparted from the earliest stages of study.

The 119 pages of tables appended to the book are detailed and comprehensive, systematic and of great value.

One criticism that can be made of the textual material is the tendentiousness of the subjects selected, which are often too political and concerned with ideological subjects. On the other hand, this is counterbalanced by the conversation parts *bytovoi razgovor*, which are excellent, giving a wide vocabulary for everyday life, which would be useful for travel in the USSR.

I. TIDMARSH.

RUSSIAN GRAMMAR

Sovremennyy Russki Yazyk : Leksikologia, Fonetika, Morfologia. (Modern Russian : lexics, phonetics, morphology.) By E. M. Galkina-Fedoruk, K. V. Gorshkova and H. M. Shansky. (Moscow : Uchpedgiz, 1958, 411 pp. 7r.)

Sovremennyy Russki Yazyk : Sintaksis (Modern Russian : syntax.) Edited by E. M. Galkina-Fedoruk. (Moscow University, 1957. Available from Collet's Russian Bookshop. 515 pp. 13r. 80k., 16/6.)

Sbornik Uprazhnenii po Sintaksisu i Razvitiu Rechi. (Exercises in syntax for foreign students.) (Leningrad University, 1958. Available from Collet's Russian Bookshop. 222 pp., 4r. 25k., 3/6.)

Iz Istarii Izucheniia Russkogo Sintaksisa. (History of Russian syntax.) By Academician V. V. Vinogradov. (Moscow University, 1958, 400 pp., 18r. 55k., 22/6.)

OF these four books, all in Russian, the first deals with lexics, phonetics and morphology, and is used in Russian universities. It represents the lectures delivered by the authors in Moscow University and the pedagogical institutes, and revised by them. The authors' aim is, in brief, to present a scientifically based theory of the phonetics, lexics, word-building and grammar of the modern Russian language, and also of its orthography and punctuation.

The second book, written by holders of chairs of Russian language, completes the university course in modern Russian. The book contains not only a description and classification of syntax material, but also explanations of each particular feature. Written by different authors, the separate chapters all show an individual character in the presentation of their subject-matter. This does not affect the integrity of the course, in spite of the presence of different opinions regarding certain points. Those who can read Russian will see from this book how Russian syntax is studied in Russia.

The collection of exercises in the third book is designed for foreign-speaking university students in their second or third year. The texts are therefore not graded from the lexical point of view: the student is expected to have a fair vocabulary, and to be able to work with a dictionary. The exercises are of two kinds: before the texts they are on syntax and punctuation, and after the texts mostly lexical.

Vinogradov's book, the most interesting of the four, presents the history of the development of Russian grammatical theory and practice. It gives a comprehensive survey, the first since the works on this subject of Grunsky (1911) and Kul'man (1917), of the principal stages of linguistic science in Russia, from Lomonosov to the present time. The book constitutes only the first half of the course "An introduction to Russian syntax" delivered in the University of Moscow by Professor Vinogradov in 1948-49.

ANNA H. SEMEONOFF.

RUSSIAN FORMS

Studies in Russian Forms and Uses: The Present Gerund and Active Participle. W. A. Morison. (Faber, 75 pp., 21/-.)

THIS is a valuable study aid written largely in the form of sentences illustrating the use of the present gerund and active participle. It is accurate, thorough and practical. It is helpful on stress. It indicates non-literary elements and sentences "divergent from the standards of modern educated speech". The sections on the gerund could have been read with profit by Gogol and Tolstoy!

Unfortunately the book tries to do too much. In order to make his examples useful for sentence drill, the author follows too many side tracks, hoping to "throw light on a number of other matters"—which indeed he does. But is it necessary in a book on the gerund and participle to explain that the surname Tavrov is connected with *tavro* ("brand", "stamp"), or to give the stress pattern of the imperfective aspect of a verb *svodit'*, which is used in the perfective in an example illustrating the gerund of the verb *znat'*? Some of the material is presented in a confusing manner, e.g. the translation of a Russian sentence on page 31: "I", says (she) (*pr. yagrit*), "wouldn't mind (lit. "am-not-away-from") (getting) married; only where will (= can) you (one) find him (i.e. a husband), sitting (*sider'*); "if one sits") at home (see note below; all the time as I do)? . . . (the reporter of this conversation is a female match-maker, *svakha*).

One or two minor quibbles could be made, e.g. page 39, if *mólcha* were a gerund it would be stressed *molchá*; page 52, is not *dorozhka* here "the runway" and not little-road (path)?; page 62, "on the second course" is un-English for "in the second year".

Good as it is, the book would perhaps have gained from being shorter, more strictly relevant, and as a result cheaper. But it is to be welcomed as a new venture, and the first, one hopes, of a series.

R. F. CHRISTIAN.

TOLSTOY FOR STUDENTS

Lev Tolstoy : Selections. Ed. N. Duddington and N. Gorodetzky. (Clarendon; O.U.P., 207 pp., 18/-.)

THE editors of this third volume of the series Oxford Russian Readers are to be congratulated not only on their choice of author and range of selections but also on being the first in the field with a book of this kind for readers of Russian. Until now we have had selections of short stories by major writers revealing the rich variety of theme, mood and style to be found in Russian literature, but no serious attempt has been made to provide an intro-

duction to an author's work and thought by careful selection from his writings.

To "give the reader some idea of Tolstoy's chief works of fiction as well as of his thought and convictions", extracts have been chosen from novels, stories, newspaper articles, letters and autobiographical studies. With a writer as prolific as Tolstoy the immediate problem as to what to include must have been formidable. Not all may agree on the final choice, but few will deny that the choice is a good one.

A brief introduction to the life and works of Tolstoy, notes on the extracts, giving both background information and grammatical explanations, an accented text, lists of selected idioms and difficult constructions, and a vocabulary section very helpful on peculiarities of stress and declension of certain nouns justify perhaps the price—18/- for some 206 pages.

The book has minor defects (not all difficult grammar points are clarified and some of the background notes are irrelevant in their detail), but the one serious shortcoming is its failure to deal adequately with the Russian verb. All students of Russian would appreciate an improvement here.

A. A. POPE.

MANUAL FOR SCIENTISTS

Manual of Scientific Russian. T. F. Magner.
(Mayflower, 102 pp., 37/-.)

THE author has succeeded in compiling one of the best manuals of scientific Russian available. Out of 100 pages, 74 are devoted to a serious study of the grammar. The method—long advocated by individual teachers of Russian—of employing universally known words as reading exercises is a welcome innovation in a grammar. Here we find the names of continents, countries and renowned political personalities, names of men known to scientists the world over, and general terms recognisable to almost everyone (Kant, statistika, signal, temperatura). The fact that these words have no stress marks—although verbs, adverbs, etc., do have them elsewhere in the book—does not make them less valuable, since no claim is made by the author that the manual is designed for any purpose other than to enable the student to read Russian scientific texts.

The grammatical rules are given concisely and comprehensively. These are well organised and sectionalised, so that cross-references are made effortless. The most frequently used verbs, adjectives and adverbs are brought in as aids to idiomatic sentence structure.

Section V on techniques of translation, giving words, phrases and short sentences and showing how they are to be translated, is invaluable. It is a pity that the

author has devoted only two pages to this section. The rest of the material, from page 79 to page 89, comprises texts taken bodily from Soviet sources. Three short passages are from the *Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya*, the remainder from Soviet scientific material. Whether, on the basis of the grammar given in this manual, the student would be able to read and understand these texts, however, is open to question.

In the introduction the author brings to the attention of the uninitiated the similarity in form and meaning of "specific scientific terms" in both English and Russian. Although this is true in most instances, the student would be well advised to tread cautiously here. There are many Russian words which, on the face of it, sound "international" but which in fact have different—and sometimes opposite—meanings. Here, too, it would have been helpful if the author had pointed out that, strictly speaking, the letter "f" is not a Russian letter, and that all Russian words containing that letter are of non-Russian origin.

The author gives some useful hints as to the idiomatic use of such words as *yavlyat'-sa* (page 29), although why *predstavlyayet soboi* (page 68) is translated only as "represents" (particularly since this phrase is so frequently to be met with in Russian texts) is an omission which is regrettable. Other incomplete translations (*kogda-nibud*, *kogda-to*, etc., in the section on "Frequently used Adverbs" on pages 69–70) can be misleading. A student just beginning to study Russian does not yet "feel" the language, and words which have idiomatic undertones should be dealt with extremely carefully.

In all, this book is a valuable contribution to the still inadequate stock of Russian books available to the ever-increasing number of students of Russian.

However, it came as a surprise to the writer that a book of 100 pages, costing 37/-, published in the USA should contain a separate, detached page listing corrections and additions—a shortcoming so reminiscent of the Soviet publications of the 1920s.

I. B. FADEN.

FOR STUDENTS OF RUSSIAN

The authors of Russian Syntax (Oxford University Press), reviewed in our summer issue under this title, write about our review:

R. F. Christian: I would be glad if you would publish a correction of some of the *factual* errors made in Anna Semeonoff's review of *Russian Syntax* in your summer issue. It is not my business, of course, to quarrel with her own opinions, but I do object to flagrant errors of fact. To mention just a few:

(1) She quotes as an inaccuracy "the

statement in section 19 that *dolg* ('debt') may be used only in the plural". If you look up section 19 you will see that it reads: "*Dolg*, which means both 'debt' and 'duty' in the singular, only means 'debts' in the plural."

(2) She says "the absence of an idiom equivalent to the English 'there is' and the construction replacing it are not dealt with". In fact sections 324-330 are devoted to the translation of the verb "to be", including "there is".

(3) She says "particles . . . are not treated at all". In fact sections 418-422 are devoted to *a*, *i* and *zhe*, and various other particles are dealt with elsewhere.

F. M. Borras: Perhaps the worst misstatement is that we say that certain verbs are followed by *chto* and the subjunctive. If the reviewer had turned the page (151-2) she would have read the following: "Such verbs are followed by the conjunction *chto*, and the subjunctive particle *by* is formed to *chto*, making one word *chtoby* (*chtob*)."
I should be grateful if you could make this correction.

Anna Semeonoff replies: I am sorry that Mr. Christian feels that I have misrepresented him. Taking his numbered points in order:

(1) I must admit that I misread section 19; the form of the second half of the sentence led me to overlook the first part.

(2) My point here was that the book contains no mention of the most useful Russian equivalent of "there is", as explained in paragraph 6 of my *Grammar*, i.e. the absence of any equivalent words. Section 326 deals only with *est'* and *byvat'*, both of which are relatively uncommon constructions, implying some degree of emphasis.

(3) In Russian particles rank as a separate part of speech (*chastitsy*), and are in fact one of the characteristic features of the language. The book contains no systematic treatment of particles — indeed, the word does not appear in the index. *A* and *i* are dealt with in sections 418-422, as Mr. Christian says, but they are conjunctions, and he himself so classifies them.

Personally, I would consider that I had given the book a generous review.

In publishing these observations, we would repeat the conclusion of our review that Russian Syntax will certainly be appreciated by students of Russian.

SHORTER NOTICES

Ukrainian-English Dictionary. Compiled by C. H. Andrusyshen and J. N. Krett. (Toronto University Press: O.U.P., 1,163 pp., 96/-.)

THIS dictionary contains some 130,000 words, compared with the 60,000 of Podvensko's smaller Ukrainian-English dictionary published in Kiev in 1955. A large proportion of the extra words is due to the inclusion of a great many regional

and dialect words, and forms connected with the Church liturgy. The smaller dictionary, in fact, contains useful terms not included in this work; but neither Podsenko's dictionary nor the larger Ukrainian-Russian dictionary published in Kiev was available to Andrusyshen and Krett when they were compiling their lists. The usefulness of their dictionary to readers of the increasing number of scientific and literary publications appearing in Ukrainian would have been greater if they had used the standard orthography of the Ukrainian SSR (with its 40,000,000 population), and not the spelling favoured by the Ukrainian communities in America; this attempt of the tail to wag the dog seems to have been dictated by cold war considerations rather than genuine scientific reasons. Despite this major drawback, the dictionary will be found useful to supplement Podvensko's work.

H. C. CREIGHTON.

Life and Work of Academician Nikolai Zelinsky. Y. Yuriev and R. Levina. (FLPH, Moscow, 127 pp. Distributed by Central Books Ltd., 3/6.)

THIS is a short biography of Academician Nikolai Zelinsky followed by a much lengthier treatment of his main lines of work. These covered synthesis of hydro-carbons, various reactions including isomerisation of hydrocarbons as well as similar work with heterocyclic compounds. As early as the beginning of this century he was carrying out work in the field of petroleum chemistry, and the book reports that a Russian plant was manufacturing nitrobenzene and aniline from crude oil feed stocks in "the early nineteen hundreds". This name does not appear in British textbooks, and students of the history of science may find it interesting to look through this small volume.

ISRAEL BERKOVITCH

KAZAKH ART

The Oral Art and Literature of the Kazakhs in Russian Central Asia by Thomas G. Winner, reviewed in our summer issue, is published in Great Britain by Cambridge University Press at 45/-.

All publications of the FLPH (Foreign Languages Publishing House), Moscow, reviewed in this issue are held in the SCR Library, and may be borrowed from it. Provincial readers are invited to make use of the library's postal lending service. FLPH editions which are available through bookshops are indicated at the heads of reviews, with their English prices.

SCR

14 KENSINGTON SQUARE, LONDON, W.8 WEstern 1571-4

OFFICERS 1958-59

President

D. N. PRITT, Q.C.

Vice-Presidents :

LORD CHORLEY OF KENDAL, MILES MALLESON, LADY SIMON OF WYTHENSHAWE.

Chairman

LIPMANN KESSEL, M.C., M.B.E., F.R.C.S.

Vice-Chairmen

D. T. RICHNELL, B.A., F.L.A., PROF. J. S. SPINK, M.A., D. de l'UNIV.

Secretary

H. C. CREIGHTON, M.A.

Executive Committee

LEONARD CASSINI, DR. L. CROME, M.C., M.R.C.P., R. W. DAVIES, Ph.D., MARTIN LAWRENCE, MISS D. LEVIN, JACK LINDSAY, THE HON. IVOR MONTAGU, A. G. MORTON, Ph.D., MRS. JOAN ROBINSON, M.A., ANDREW ROTHSTEIN, M.A., JULIUS SILVERMAN, M.P., MRS. JOAN SIMON, MISS JUDITH TODD, MISS MONICA WHATELY, CDR. E. P. YOUNG, R.N.(rtd.).

Sections

Chess. *President* : Prof. L. S. Penrose, F.R.S.

Education. *President* : Lady Simon of Wythenshawe. *Vice-Presidents* : G. D. B. Gray, Prof. J. A. Lauwerys, Dame Olive Wheeler. *Chairman* : Miss D. Levin.

History & Archaeology. *Chairman* : Robert Browning, M.A.

Medical. *Chairman* : Dr. Brian Kirman. *Secretary* : Dr. L. Crome.

Science. *Chairman* : Dr. J. P. Harding.

Theatre. *President* : Miles Malleeson. *Vice-Presidents* : John Burrell, Joseph McLeod, Dame Sybil Thorndike.

ROYAL ALBERT HALL

Manager : C. R. Hopper

VICTOR HOCHHAUSER in association with the Corporation of the ROYAL ALBERT HALL

presents

THE WORLD'S GREATEST DANCERS

THE GEORGIAN STATE DANCE COMPANY

FROM THE CAUCASUS



Following upon the successful season last year of THE UKRAINIAN STATE COSSACK COMPANY at this hall, we have great pleasure in presenting once again one of the most fabulous dance companies from the USSR on their first appearance in this country. Wherever they have appeared, the fantastic dancing of this ensemble has been rightly compared with THE BOLSHOI BALLET. THE GEORGIAN STATE DANCE COMPANY enjoys a legendary reputation for superb agility, breathtaking leaps and glorious spectacle. These contrast with some beautifully serene and exquisite dancing scenes as well as hilarious comic interludes. The hand-embroidered costumes lend brilliant colour to this exciting ensemble. This Company has been hailed as the best in the USSR, and those who saw THE UKRAINIAN STATE COSSACK COMPANY last year will have yet another chance to see SOVIET DANCING AT ITS BEST.

Monday, November 9, to Wednesday, November 25

NIGHTLY 7.30, including SUNDAYS (Saturday, November 14, at 8.30)

(No performance on Monday, November 16)

3/6, 5/-, 7/6, 10/6, 12/6, 15/-, 17/6, 21/- from Royal Albert Hall Box Office,
S.W.7 (KEN. 8212) and all agents

SPECIAL CHILDREN'S MATINEES

Sunday, November 15, and

Saturday, November 21

FOR SPECIAL PARTY BOOKING CONCESSIONS,
PLEASE APPLY TO THE BOX OFFICE, ROYAL ALBERT
HALL, S.W.7 (Kensington 8212).